DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 000 HE 003 037

AUTHOR	Perry, Richard R.; And Others
TITLE	The Organized Organization: The American University and Its Administration.
INSTITUTION	Toledo Univ., Ohio.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	131p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Activism; *Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; *Governance; *Higher Education; Universities

ABSTRACT

College and university administrators in the past few years have not found their job an easy one. The very nature of higher education makes it difficult to organize and administrate a university. This document presents several essays that are designed to clarify options open to an educational administrator. The topics are: "The University Administrator: From Where Has He Come?" by W. Frank Hull; "Thoughts About the Collapse of Academic Government and the Possibilities for Its Revival," by W. Max Wise; "Organization and Administration of a University: A Philosopher's Perspective," by Henry Margenau; "The Regional University and Comprehensive College: Some Ideas," by Richard E. Peterson; "The Individual in the Organized University," by T. R. McConnell; and "Restructuring the University," by Richard R. Perry. (HS)

ED 067000

THE ORGANIZED ORGANIZATION:

The American University and Its Administration

The Office of Institutional Research
Richard R. Perry

The Center for the Study of Higher Education
W. Frank Hull IV

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Univ. of Toledo

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
1971

HE 003 037

Copyright ©1971 by The University of Toledo

Table of Contents

	Foreword	William S. Carlson	7
	Preface		9
I	The University Administrator: From Where Has He Come?	W. Frank Hull IV	11
II	Thoughts About the Collapse of Academic Government and the Possibilities for Its Revival	W. Max Wise	25
III	Organization and Administration of a University: A Philosopher's Perspective	Henry Morgenau	51
IV	The Regional University and Comprehensive College: Some Ideas	Richard E. Peterson	73
V	The Individual in the Organized University	T. R. McConnell	97
VI	Restructuring the University	Richard R. Perry	119
	Bibliography		133

Foreword

The very nature of higher education makes it difficult to organize or administer a university. It is fragile — one need only recall some of the events of the last five years to see how powerless the institution may be in time of danger. At the same time it is stubborn, resistant to change, even when for its own good. Universities move with the speed of those glaciers I once studied and about which I teach. There can be little effective administration unless there is good organization. This is because one needs a framework within which to operate. Only then does one get an idea of the parts that make up the whole and now and then, perhaps, a glimpse of how they are related to each other.

No wonder that introspection is such a popular academic pastime. We do self studies, we hire management consulting firms, we are subjected to visits (some call them visitations, but that has theological connotations) by teams from accrediting bodies and by legislative representatives. We run ourselves through the wringer and through the computer. What comes out tells us just too much quantitatively and not enough otherwise. In the long run the effectiveness of organization is determined not by that carefully drawn chart, but by the people whose names are found in the boxes there.

But as I have noted, we look at ourselves constantly because we are uneasy about the changing demands of society, of our faculty and of our students — not to mention all

the other segments of the public which have some interest in what we do and how we do it. We know that there must be better ways to set up the machinery of the educational system and to keep it in motion; in the right direction, of course, providing we can figure out what direction that is.

Our concern with our present shortcomings convinces us that there is need to discuss now some possibilities for the organization of higher education in the future. If we do not give it our best thoughts we may find ourselves frozen into patterns that have evolved out of expediency and which could bar the way to true progress.

The papers published here express the thinking of some outstanding scholars as presented in faculty seminars at The University of Toledo. They were stimulating, which was their sole purpose. It is hoped that they may prove so to the reader.

I cannot close this short foreword without complimenting and thanking Richard R. Perry, Associate Executive Vice President for Institutional Research and Administrative Planning, for arranging the seminars and bringing the participants to The University of Toledo.

William S. Carlson
President
The University of Toledo

Preface

The administration of institutional attempts toward the education of youth has long been a controversial issue. Some administrators have served many years with profound dedication; others have had rocky and short careers. The first American administrative head of a "higher education" institution was one of the latter. Nathaniel Eaton at the age of 27, first principal of Harvard College, was clearly unsuccessful. "Of this man," Josiah Quincy is reported to have remarked, "nothing has been transmitted worthy of being repeated."[1] One of Principal Eaton's students was even more specific when he claimed that Eaton was " . . . fitter to have been an officer in the inquisition, or a master of a house of correction, than an instructor of Christian youth."[2]

Today some administrators may feel akin to their first counterpart, but the issues have changed. American institutions of higher education have swollen to the point where the paternal administration of the past is impossible. Whereas past administrators could typically look forward to respect and dignity from students, faculty, and community, together with a long life, today's university president has an expected career of about ten years, full of constant pressure and

---

[1] cf. Richard G. Boone. *Education in the United States.* New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1893, 23.

[2] William Hubbard (Class of 1642). *General History of New England* (1848 ed.), 247.

battering from all sides, and the realistic future of retiring early with an ulcer.

Yet institutions and administrators continue to try to serve the needs of America's potentially creative youth, and it remains an honor for men and women to be selected by society to work with this pool of talent. The question to be asked, however, is how shall our increasingly complex institutions be administered and structured so that the constantly enduring purpose of higher education — to provide education for society's benefit — can be done effectively, creatively, and with the best intent possible?

The essays that follow are pregnant with options. Not one, however, attempts to tell any single institution how it should administer itself. Clearly, to do so would be preposterous. In the last analysis, administrative organization and procedures must continue to be formed from the interrelation of the particular goals of the individual institution and its personnel.

Hopefully, from these essays will come some openness on the part of some institutions to reconsider their administrative operations and to ask the hard questions as to what within their operations is valid for today and what merely represents a blind obedience to "the way we have always done it."

As always, many individuals have devoted long hours to the production of the manuscript. To mention them all is impossible, but clearly the editors would be amiss not to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Mrs. Nancy Grubbs, Mrs. Suzette Gebolys and Mrs. Marlene Grubinski for their excellent cooperation and skill.

1 May, 1971
W. Frank Hull IV
Richard R. Perry

The Center for the
Study of Higher Education
The University of Toledo

I.

The University Administrator: From Where Has He Come?

W. Frank Hull IV*

As the decade of the 1970's begins, university and college administrators again find themselves coming under both extreme and diverse criticism. To some observers, administrators appear to be living illustrations of the Parkinson Law which posits that the job expands to fill what ever time is allotted to it. Often administrators appear to faculty and students as lesser bookkeepers with a highly developed knack of taking the simplest matter and making it complex, with triplicate computerized copies requiring five separate signatures for approval — all to insure "efficiency." Other faculty and students see them as performing the key "service function" of the university that permits faculty to teach and carry on professional investigations with minimum concern for general or particular detail relating to the total university. Townsfolk may view them as weak and unwilling to enforce "discipline," while students and some faculty may feel them to be rigid and overly enthralled with their own authoritarian procedures.

Whatever one's view of the administrator, one thing is clear: American higher education has developed a plethora of

*Assistant Professor of Higher Education, The University of Toledo.

them. Administering administrators themselves often becomes a nightmare. One survey in the 1930's at an eminent American institution discovered no less than 70 administrators and committees directly responsible to the president.[1] A second survey discovered that administrative officers had increased from 3 to 5, with 347 varying titles between 1865 and 1930 at 30 North Central liberal arts colleges.[2] The increase continues to grow today by the constant redefinitions of assistant deans, assistants to, and various specialized offices. To many, not only the number of administrators, but the total administrative system can only be seen as chaotic at best. Yet recently a movement has begun to form a national association of professional administrators and most projections anticipate an increase in the number of administrative policies, procedures, and personnel, rather than a decrease.

All of this may be as it should, but in any consideration of reforming university administration it is helpful to remember how, when, and under what conditions university administrators arose. The Hellenistic educational system and even that of Socrates and Plato's Academy, held by some to be the "ideal" system of liberal education, had no administrators. But universities have grown since then. The purpose of this paper is to present briefly the historical background of today's college and university administrator.

Medieval Origins

Higher education, as it is known today, began to assume characteristic forms around 1200 A.D. The term "university" first referred to any number, any plurality, any aggregate of persons found gathered together.[3] In the strictest sense of

---

[1] John Dale Russel, "Changing Patterns of Administrative Organization in Higher Education." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science* (September, 1955), 26.

[2] Earl McGrath, "The Evolution of Administrative Offices in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States, 1860-1933." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1938.)

[3] Hastings Rashdal, *Universities of Europe in Middle Ages*, (F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, Eds.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895 (1936), 5.

the word, "university" was a term used to refer to any guild, no matter the professional concern of its members. But early in the 1200's the term came to be restricted to usage to a gathering of "scholars." By the 15th century "university" was synonymous with "studium generale," a place where students gathered. The evolution of the term itself is illustrative of the still prevailing notion that the central purpose of the university is to be a body of men gathered together as scholars where knowledge is preserved, transmitted, and investigated. Also after 1200, scholars and students began to gather in groups of more than just one to one. For the scholar, there was now the need to decide which students would be permitted to study with him. "Admission" was decided purely on the wishes of the scholar. Once this was determined, the student would begin to work with that faculty member individually, attending his lectures and participating in disputations with him. But in order for the period of study between a scholar and a student to come to fruition, a terminal point was necessary. Here the need arose to indicate what the period of study qualified one for, and how it was to be determined that the period of study was, in fact, over.

An early way of solving this practical problem was through the appointment of a chancellor. The chancellor, as ecclesiastical representative of the Roman Catholic Church, was responsible neither to students, faculty, nor to anyone else but the Church. He alone had the authority from the Church to grant "degrees" and could make arbitrary and final decisions about who was to receive such "degrees" and when. The "license to teach," as the degree was called, was primarily used to prepare a scribe or cleric to work within the Church, or to indicate that the holder was qualified to lecture and teach others with the implied, if ambiguous, approval of his scholarship by the Church. The chancellor's position developed from the practice of assigning one cleric attached to a Cathedral with the supervision of all education carried on within the confines of the cathedral, for adults as well as children. Sometimes referred to as *scholasticus*, the chancellor came to exercise control over the theological institutes or

courses developed by the larger cathedrals. As a representative of the Church, though, the chancellor had the authority to excommunicate from the Church anyone deviating from the "truth." Consequently, the chancellor became the authoritarian, arbitrary figure within the body of scholars developing typically around the cathedral.

Faculty and students, however, were unwilling to accept for very long such arbitrary decision-making to administer their operations. The result was an increasing tension between the chancellor on the one hand, and the faculty and students on the other, culminating periodically in open rebellion. In the 1200's, the antagonisms between the chancellor and other factions of the university were so intense that the faculty was recognized by the Church as an autonomous body, and the chancellor typically became a figurehead serving perfunctory duties. At that point, it became a tradition for students and faculty to elect the functionaries whom they felt to be necessary for the "good of their order," rather than to have such appointed by an outside authority, be he Pope, King, or anyone else. Scholars were considered of such worth that they soon were granted not only autonomy but immunity from many civil regulations as well.[4]

Students and faculty became organized into separate bodies. One early division was by faculties. The faculty of arts at many schools, for example, before the student received a mastership, required an oath of obedience to the decrees of its faculty and subsequently massed a great deal of power to make its opinions known throughout the University as a whole.[5] A further early division to gain power within the university was that which was referred to as a "nation." Gathering together for mutual enhancement and protection, students from a given geographical area often together with similar faculty would form a particular nation. At the University of Paris there were four such nations around

[4] cf. Pearl Kibre. *Scholarly Privileges in the Middle Ages.* Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1962.

[5] cf. Dana C. Munro. *The Middle Ages, 395-1272.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1922, 369 et passim.

1220: the French, the Normans, the Picards, and the English. Sometimes nations were subdivided into "tribes." For example, the French nation at Paris consisted of five tribes — Paris, Sens, Rheims, Tours, Bourges.[6] Individual nations began to elect "proctors" or "councilors" to represent their interests. Together the proctors formed a university council.

Almost simultaneously, the total body of faculty and students came to feel the need to have one individual set aside to represent their corporate concerns. This person came to be called the "rector." Although the method of election varied between institutions, the rector was typically selected in one of several ways: by faculty vote, by faculty-student vote, by student vote, or by vote of the nation's "proctors" together with the deans of the faculties. The rector typically was elected to office for a period of one year after which time he returned to the position from which he had come. In southern Europe, the rector was often a student. At the University of Paris, to insure that no one developed a monopoly, the rector was elected several times a year.[7] The rector presided over all meetings within the university. It was his responsibility to decide discipline cases or any matters on qualification of university members, be they students or faculty. He symbolized the developing university in all ceremonies within the university itself or the community. As for operation expenses, the rector held a monopoly over the sale of parchment.

It is important to note that the rector was a symbol of representative administration. His term and duties were limited; in some institutions he was half-time while carrying on teaching and scholarly functions. Faculties, who were now autonomous bodies, however, were not about to give up their complete authority to the rector. Rather they were attempting to fill a corporate need in the person of one member who could act as "administrator" on their behalf. In doing so,

---

[6] Robert Goulet, *Compendium Universitatis Parisiensis*. Paris: Toussains Denis, 1517. tr. Robert B. Burke. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1929, 37-45.

[7] Rashdall. op. cit., 323.

however, the university began to develop the conception of multiple administrators serving specific functions.

As the university increased in size, various tasks came to be seen as necessary for corporate operation. Quickly it was recognized that there was a need to keep some rudimentary form of records for faculty use and future reference. This function fell to the "beadle." The beadle, like the rector, was chosen for a limited period of time (usually one year) from within the faculty. His task was to perform the daily chores necessary for the efficient operation of the medieval institution. As such, he was to carry out all tasks assigned to him by the rector and proctors. It was his responsibility to see that bells were rung to call students to class and to dismiss them to other lectures, to inform all members of the university as to the time when lectures would be given and the subject of said lectures, to announce all university decisions and policies, and to carry the mace in all academic processions. The beadle acted as sergeant at arms at faculty meetings and kept a list of graduates achieving at least the master of art degree. Of sufficient importance were the duties of the beadle that there was a list of fines and penalities to be enforced whenever he did not carry out his duties. Upon assuming office, the beadle was required to take an oath of obedience to his "nation," to the faculty as a whole, and to the present rector of the university. In short, it was the beadle who became the first college administrator responsible for the daily operation of the institution.

Other officers developed in the medieval administration were the dean or prior, the treasurer, receptor or steward, and the notary, archivist or registrer. A university assembly was constituted as the place in which corporate matters could be discussed and decided. By 1309 most of the above were firmly established within university organization and were permanent, rather than part-time, positions of elected officials. It was true, though, that some of these positions were often honorary functions deemed a suitable reward for a scholar wanting to leave the rigors of scholarly pursuits. But it is important to recognize that even within the medieval university, with all of its flexibility and idealism of scholar-

ship, there were specific, functional tasks which the faculty deemed necessary. Those selected out of the faculty to perform these tasks were the first administrators.

The Board of Control

It soon became necessary to have some method of making policy decisions affecting the university as a whole beyond the institution itself. Although the medieval institution tended to stress faculty autonomy, within the Italian university there had developed a system whereby civil authorities appointed boards of control. The tradition of having such a "board of control" was further structured within Scottish institutions where external boards of control (i.e., made up of members not related to the institution) made decisions. Such external boards were in existence at the University of Leyden in 1575 and Cambridge in 1582 — as well as elsewhere.

It was through the Scottish tradition of boards of control, though, that the early colonial colleges adopted a similar system. Harvard had a temporary board of overseers appointed on November 20, 1637, and reorganized on September 27, 1642. The corporation of Harvard was established by the Charter in 1650 as a self-perpetuating board, overseeing the development of the College and made up of 1) the president, 2) the bursar, and 3) five fellows. The bursar, from the beginning, had an important place on he board. Clearly the financing of higher education has always affected the administrative structure within the institution of higher education, for without funds even the most ideal education philosophy is apt to fold.

From the colonial colleges on, methods of institutional control within the United States had varied. In many cases, control has been invested in a lay board. Other institutions have used a board composed of clergy, while still others set up boards consisting of representatives of the various constituencies that the institution hoped to serve. Thus, the land grant college movement developed a specific kind of board tailored to the then agricultural-emphasis college. Boards of

trustees to this day tend to be made up of men felt by someone to represent needed interests or qualities necessary or of potential benefit to the individual institution. It has never been uncommon to find board members selected for their ability in helping the institution with fund raising or financial management rather than for significant accomplishments within higher education. In other words, boards of control in whatever sense the word "control" has been used, have varied greatly. Among the issues affecting the board's composition have been the institution's geographic location, financial situation, and purposes.

The College President

The only administrative officer found within every institution of American higher education has been a chief administrative officer, referred to as president, chancellor or principal. Initially, college presidents were primarily teachers who assumed the minimal tasks of management and control within the institution. Almost universally, the early college president in the United States was also a clergyman. This was true precisely because a central aim of the colonial college was to train clergymen. But besides the president, who often also served as librarian and filled any other need necessary, there was little in the way of administrative organization. The president was both scholar and administrator. The small number of students within any particular institution made this feasible. Charles W. Eliot directed Harvard in 1869 with a total student body of 570; Johns Hopkins had 96 undergraduates and 166 graduate students in the 1880's.[9] As late as 1917, college presidents were regularly found teaching within the undergraduate program of instruction. But after the 1900's and especially by the 1930's, the college president position experienced a shift away from having exclusive control over the institution and its faculty. Confusion has always existed as to his role. From one perspective, the president is "not a leader, but a boss"; from another, he is a "leader

[9] Earl McGrath, *Selected Issues in College Administration.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1967, 3.

among scholars" — but recently he has come to be foremost a fund raiser.

Additional Administrative Officers

The second officer to develop within the American college administration was the librarian. Again, the reason was a functional one. Someone was needed to assume responsibility for a growing collection of books. When the use and quantity of books became sufficiently widespread that the president was no longer able to operate the library on a part-time basis, the librarian became a member of the president's staff. Beginning around 1875, the college librarian appeared as a part-time faculty member who accepted library duties as part of his responsibilities. Only much later did the duties of the librarian become a full-time function, and his office, while still reporting to the president, come to be viewed as neither administrative nor faculty.

The third administrative officer to come into being was the registrar. The registrar evolved from a clerk, who in turn evolved from the medieval university's "beadle." When the clerk's tasks became sufficiently laborious, the registrar developed as a specialist. Yet the clearest date of this occurrence in the United States was not until the 1880's or 1890's when the "elective system" and the consequent developments within American higher education provided the student with increasing freedom of choice involved. That person was the registrar.

The fourth administrative officer to follow the president within American higher education was the "dean." In the fourth century, the term "dean," freely translated, referred to a member of a society whose specific duty was to bury its dead. Although evolution of the term from the fourth century into the 19th is anything but clear, it became the dean's function to serve the institution in details of academic concern. In general, few colleges had a dean prior to World War I, and it was only after the increase in the number of students following World War I (and especially around 1929) that deans became common within American higher education.

The impact of the dean as a significant member of the institution's decision-making structure occured in the 1930's.

By the end of the 19th century most American colleges and universities had discovered a need for an additional specialist. The need was specific enough that this officer was normally not chosen from within the faculty. The officer in question was the business manager. All early indications are that the business manager was a powerful figure within the administrative structure of the early 20th century institution. It was his skills that forced idealistic educational philosophies to be reshaped in the pragmatic terms of dollars and cents. There can be little doubt that the relationship between the business manager, dealing with the hard realities of cash, and the faculty, dealing with more pervasive question of scholarship and individual development, has often been strained.

Although some members of the administration gained their place due to specific needs within the college, one group seemed to evolve primarily because of a specifically American development in educational philosophy: the "student personnel" administrator. Especially within the 18th and 19th century Catholic colleges, denominational and women's institutions began to feel it proper to regulate certain aspects of students' lives. Although the same aims were recognized by the English colleges, the development in America was unique. Non-academic functions previously handled occasionally by the dean of the college, such as discipline and housing, were assigned to a student personnel dean who took it upon himself to direct "services" of a noncurricular nature. Vocational and personal counseling along with attempts to organizing extracurricular activities both within and without dormitory units and to remain "in touch" with student groups like fraternities and various clubs grew rapidly after World War I. American higher education had often shown concern for the more personal and developmental benefits of a college education. At this point, however, the concern came to be institutionalized in the office of an administrator.

The dean of women was an early functionary modeled after the preceptress in a dormitory, who often taught English. The reason for her existence, though, was that she was

needed to be available to women at a time when the place of coeducation within higher education was viewed as uncertain at best. Counseling specialists following an increased emphasis on general mental health, were developed along with vocational counseling and testing personnel in the 1930's.

Other administrators began to appear within American higher education after World War I. The admissions officer came about as a result of the testing movement in the 1920's and the attention devoted to the secondary-college articulation question at the turn of the century. He was still not commonly found, however, until the 1930's when he typically also assumed responsibilities for recruiting students in some institutions. At first, the admissions officer had the responsibility to fill the student enrollment to keep the institution financially solvent. The major impact of the admissions officer, however, came after World War II when increasing numbers of students began to apply for higher education. Here his task shifted to one of "selection."

The public relations officer came from the office of publicity and information (sometimes from the alumni office), again following World War I. The function of this office was to minimize the need for the president to concern himself with the public image of the college when other duties became more pressing.

The alumni office itself developed to meet a functional need. While Williams College (1821) saw the alumni association as a social organization contributing to the "spirit of the alumni," it was not until after the 1890's that institutions realized the potential for fund raising among alumni. To develop financial resources and to improve the university's image were the specific needs which the alumni officer was expected to satisfy.

Faculty specialization trends and the rapid growth in specialization of knowledge from the 1920's resulted in a strong departmental organization within higher education and the evolution of the "department chairman." The department chairman was expected to bridge the ever-widening gap between the university's total and daily operational needs and the faculty's specialized disciplines.

The 1950's saw the beginning of an administrative officer referred to as "director of institutional research," a position at first designated to increase efficiency within the now massive organization. It was to this man that the task of looking at the institution from a research point of view was assigned. At a similar time, a planning officer began to be common within institutions. Since the 1950's, titles have proliferated and numbers have been added to administrative personnel, but few significant functions have been identified requiring further major administrators.

The Trend of Administration

A historical view of American administrative officers is illuminating for several reasons. Each officer developed since the medieval period has come about in order to fulfill a specific *function* rather than to actualize goals of educational philosophies. Functional analysis of present-day administrators will illustrate this equally as well as historical analysis.

The administrator has developed to handle details and operations which faculty were unable or unwilling to assume. It is true that administrative duties have been utilized in certain cases to provide status for an individual that the university wished to honor. On the other hand, it is equally true that administrative duties have been assigned in order to quickly remove a person from other duties better handled by another. But the general point remains, the administrator in American higher education is that person set aside to provide a specific, functional service.

This having been said, the question arises as to the growth in numbers of university administrators. Such increases in administrators have come precisely at those points in history when student enrollments have increased or outside pressures have forced the institution to take account of its operations. Before higher education came to be seen within the country as the key to success for "everyman," there were relatively few administrators. Yet as more and more students began to enter institutions of higher education, it was necessary to increase the number of appointments charged with daily

operations and records in order to keep account of the operation and deal with the students.

The increase in administrators was, furthermore, encouraged by the tendency to accept a "business model" of operation and the rise of administrative organizational theory. Today such terms as "efficiency" and "accountability" are prominent within higher education circles. This was not so 30 years ago. Even though the terms themselves are often unclear and no one is precisely sure how they should be applied to higher education or even if they are applicable at all, their acceptance is natural in a society founded on business and industry where economic growth and production increase is the corporate goal. Is not the university merely another corporation with a particular product? So goes the question. Although the validity of using corporate concepts of growth production within higher education is open to question, the fact remains that these concepts are now part of American higher education. This is increasingly true in the present and has been developing continuously since the industrial revolution.

Administrators, in many cases, have been pressed into systematizing a complex university organization by utilizing the practices of large corporations. Some of this has been a natural occurrence as clergy were replaced on boards of control by successful businessmen and college presidents were increasingly selected from the ranks of academic scholars with little training or experience in managing an increasingly complex organization. One press toward the acceptance of corporate management practice has been due to the failure of institutions to present an alternative model which could keep the institution fiscally sound and operational. Higher education is no longer limited to a select few chosen to lead our nation in statesmanship and religion. Higher education has come to be seen by many as producing viable products to fill the growth and manpower needs of the nation. When the Russian sputnik went up first, American educators overnight began to produce space-age scientists. This was not due to any pervasive educational philosophy, but rather due to an immediate, pragmatic need, possibly even a slight panic.

A more recent factor pressing for the adoption of a "business model" into higher education has been the development of computer technology. The computer has been able to assume the function of mass secretarial service, able to locate and store information of infinite complexity with near immediate access. One might have hoped that this would have lessened the need for some clerks at least. But in order to operate efficiently (which is the major advantage of the computer) the computer itself requires a specialized technologist. Once again administrative personnel increases. Today many complex institutions relay on the computer to simplify a complex system of administration and record keeping. Planning, budgeting, records, pay checks, even letters of acceptance can now be produced through computerized technology.

Few, though, stop to consider whether the initial needs that brought about the administrators are still served or whether we are not merely caught within increasingly self-perpetuating circles. What are the most basic needs within the institution? Has the purpose and intent of the administrator been lost? There have always been movements focused on changing the direction in which higher education has moved. Various educators throughout history have proclaimed the need for reorganization, but few institutions, operating under the goals of efficient and effective production, have been willing to risk the financial and total insecurity created by innovations or experiments in design. It is easier to alter an item here and there, rather than the whole. An institution, in order to survive, needs to insure that its results in students will be judged acceptable by its public—graduate schools, accrediting agencies, future employers, future students, and those who pay the bills. In the last analysis, the institution only exists to the degree that it can work with its public. An institution with no students would survive but a short time within American higher education, no matter how profoundly organized and administered. Change within the institution is indeed a slow process.

II.

Thoughts About the Collapse of Academic Government and the Possibilities for Its Revival

W. Max Wise*

It is time for those interested in our colleges and universities to recognize that *functioning* government in many of these institutions has virtually ceased to exist. The evidence that such is the case includes the inability of these institutions to make choices with respect to new purposes to be served and present purposes which should be discontinued, to allocate scarce resources to functions closely associated with proclaimed purposes, to decide what students should be admitted and, perhaps even more importantly, which students should be continued to graduation. On each of these and other crucial matters, collegiate institutions find that decisions are either avoided or if made by constituted bodies, are challenged and that the systems of government are unable to apply sanctions which allow them to carry out the decisions. Thus, in any meaningful sense of what it means "to

* Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

govern"—the ability to make severely sanctioned choices—it can logically be said that many of our collegiate institutions are presently ungovernable.

The public manifestations of this sorry state of affairs are visible in the disruptions which have been regularly reported in the press and on television, and which often required the use of civil authority—courts and the police—in order to restore a semblance of order.

But what is less widely known, and seldom acknowledged within the collegiate institutions, is that the processes of government on the campus have for some time proved inadequate to resolve the basic questions of purposes and procedure so that a sense of direction could develop. In less volatile times and with relative financial solvency, the lack of effective government was tolerated, and, in the case of many faculty, applauded because their private interests were allowed free rein. Indeed, the lack of effective government was elevated by faculty to the level of principle and was justified on meritocratic grounds: that elites (faculty) possess a highly developed sense of social obligation and that if each is left free to pursue his interest, the social needs will be served. The implicit assumption is, of course, that the institution needs no sense of purpose and no decisions regarding priorities: the institution is simply the locus for the independent purposes of individuals and small groups of persons.

The challenges to these meritocratic assumptions now come from two sources:

1. Parts of the body politic argue that the meritocratic arguments of the faculty have masked the fact that they were prepared to ignore pressing social needs—reversing the decline of cities, stopping the destruction of the environment, securing justice for minorities, etc.

2. Those who must weigh the claims of colleges and universities for funds against other needs of the society have grown increasingly critical of the meritocratic posture of faculty, i.e., it is now common for heads of governmental units and prominent private citizens to question whether the demands for increased budgets represent "educational" needs. For example, in a public meeting during the summer

of 1970, the Governor of North Carolina noted that the important factor which must be considered in assessing the needs of higher education is the, " . . . ambitions of faculty because far too many of them are more concerned about prestige and fulfillment of their personal ambitions. . . than they are with the orderly development of education."[1]

Regardless of the merits of a previous period characterized by "non-governing college government," in which all difficult questions of priorities and direction were avoided and in which the power of faculty to *veto* was the principal internal defense against external social and religious groups who wished to perpetuate their control over curricula, it seems clear that a revival of effective collegiate government is now required. The colleges and universities are now near the centers of power and influence in the society and their financial needs are of sufficient magnitude as to make it impossible for them to avoid questions of priorities and direction.

Thus, while the current focus of attention, within and outside of the colleges and universities, on controlling the disrupters of campus peace is understandable, such preoccupations obscure the more fundamental problems of academia. Until the current difficulties are viewed in relation to the general and pervasive inability of the college to govern itself, no basic remedies are possible. The problem is not, therefore, to contain and resist those who wish to destroy the university; (although this may be a necessary and immediate interim step) the problem is to revive effective academic government. This requires that attention be given to the developments which have made the structures of collegiate government—boards, administrators, senates, committees, etc.,—and the customary procedures for the resolution of controversy ineffective. Those interested in reviving functioning collegiate government must recognize that decision-making procedures:

> . . . were devised in a different era, when universities were in a different situation with regard to both their internal relations and their corporate relations to the American society. It is clear that

[1] Robert W. Scott, "A Governor Comments," *Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education*, Atlanta, Sourthern Regional Education Board, August, 1970.

> the time for a reappraisal of institutional procedures is long overdue.[2]

Study of the governing processes of American colleges and universities indicates that the basic provisions for deliberating alternatives—to create separate academic units for special programs or to attach new programs to existing units, to emphasize research or to emphasize teaching, etc.—and for reaching binding decisions on vital issues were laid down in most colleges by the late 19th century and except for slight modifications have not undergone serious change since.

As will be argued later, the conditions of freedom, power and influence which prompted the development of the basic structures for decision-making in collegiate institutions half a century ago no longer pertain. In fact, the changes in these regards are so substantial as to argue not for minor alterations, but for sweeping and even radical shifts in the provisions for participation by faculty, students, trustees and others in discussion and expressions of preference on vital matters of policy.

What is required are new forms of collegiate government which are consistent with the new internal relations between members of the academic communities and the new relations of the institutions to the society. Only when a high degree of consistency in these matters has been incorporated into the formal and informal processes of deliberation and decision-making will the college again be the object of loyalty of most who are associated with it: a requisite pre-condition for the restoration of effective governing.

The Basis of Collegiate Government

The changes in collegiate government which occurred late in the 19th century and early in the 20th century, and which remain generally operative in the present period, were instituted to meet new conditions of both internal and external relationships of colleges and universities of that era.

---

[2] Quoted from a statement circulated among the faculty of Princeton University in April, 1968.

The growth of American universities and the development of the institutional structures familiar to us today began during the last two decades of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century. Studying in Germany, American scholars turned their attention from classical studies and concentrated on the research techniques of the emerging social and physical sciences. When these men returned to the United States, the existing structure of the American college seemed hopelessly inadequate, especially when it came to dealing with specialization of study fields and with research. The German model, when transported into the American environment, became seminars and graduate education, and most major colleges added graduate departments in the arts and sciences. At the same time that graduate education was expanding in the academic fields, demands for professionally trained individuals increased, and law, medical and business schools arose to meet the need. Quite different from the relatively simple structure of the American college out of which it was born, the new university was often a complex maze of departments, schools and faculties, each with its own direction and requirements, yet all part of the same mother institution. American educators faced a monumental task: *the integration* of a medusa-like institution into a thriving, harmonious and viable university that could cope with the increasing population and the ever expanding knowledge of early 20th century America.

The incorporation of specialized academic study and research into the American university had a transforming effect on the American college: undergraduate faculty members, products of the newly emerging graduate departments, modeled their careers on those of the university professors. Rather than devote their time exclusively to teaching, these newly trained professors aspired to the specialization and research orientation of their graduate education. Large members of older and more traditional faculty, however, still recognized that their primary responsibilities included substantial amounts of undergraduate teaching, and this conflict of interests created a state of tension in the college. Accommodation was achieved by three principal means: depart-

ments, emulating fields of study in the university, became the primary unit for faculty activities; modification of curricula permitted specialization of teaching; and finally, for those who found the college unsuited to their preferences, faculty mobility provided opportunities to move into university appointments.

The developments outlined above put serious strain on the traditional arrangement for academic government because they threatened the authority of trustees and presidents to determine what should be taught in colleges and universities and who should be appointed to the faculty. Faculty came to believe that scholarly work could only be carried on if each professor was free to engage in unrestricted inquiry and to teach the truth as he saw it. Furthermore, the costs of operating colleges and universities rose sharply because of specialization of effort and because the "new" faculty were in short supply.

The search for new forms of academic government which could accommodate the transformation of higher education in the early decades of the 20th century resulted in acceptance of the principle of differentiation of responsibility: the trustees gradually came to feel that they should concentrate on financial and organizational matters while the faculty concentrated on "educational" matters. Such arrangements had the advantage that each group was responsible for activities which it felt particularly prepared to discharge and the division of responsibility reduced direct conflict between persons with opposing values and perspectives.

The experience of at least some trustees with the problems of industrial corporations gave them a basis for the organization of complex academic units and for the development and management of institutional resources. In the large universities the problems of vertical and horizontal organization—problems which industrial corporations were solving with success—were familiar to many trustees and the result was that these institutions came to resemble the industrial corporation in important respects. Corporation management practices came to be a part of American higher education, although it must be added that the adaptation of corporate

management concepts to colleges and universities made allowance for a degree of independence of faculty which would not have been tolerated in the industrial corporation.

The new division of responsibilities for academic government accommodated faculty interest in two important ways. First, the modified corporation model allowed departments and other units a degree of freedom. Second, the concentration of trustees on organizational and financial questions left the faculty relatively free to develop instructional and research activities.

The changes in academic government outlined above did not, of course, develop without conflict nor did they develop uniformly in colleges and universitities. In many institutions the accommodations were reached only after dramatic and disruptive events suggested that the survival of the institutions demanded some division of responsibility. Even today the understandings will sometimes be abrogated for short periods involving potentially explosive issues. For instance, some "church-related" colleges have resisted these developments, but they are under great pressure which is proving too difficult to resist.

Thus, it can be argued that the arrangements for academic government which developed in the late 19th century and the first decades of the 20th represented an accommodation to two interest groups:

1. The men of business among trustees who insisted that the college or university should operate on business principles and that the larger institutions should emulate the most successful existing organization of resources and talent: the industrial corporation.

2. The professors representing the "new scholarship" who insisted that fields of study should be allowed to develop with a degree of autonomy and that professors should be recognized for their contributions through research and writing.

In short, what came into being was a *corporation for professional activity* which accommodated itself to the newly recognized expertise of the faculty and to the power which professional alliances (the societies of physicists, his-

torians, etc.) exerted on the institution. Thus, a new form of collective relations was born and it would, with some adaptations, be simulated in hospitals where the professional status of physicians was acknowledged and, more recently, in "research" institutions.

The political support for the new arrangements for decision-making in collegiate institutions appears to have rested on public acceptance of the new corporate structure (which had demonstrated that it was capable of integrating a variety of people and activities into a single organization) as a model of non-business institutions, on the newly developed and sometimes tentatively held belief of the leaders of the society that if scholars were left free to pursue their fields of study without interference the public good would be well served, on the feeling of trustees, presidents and most faculty that only those learned in a field were competent to make judgements about instruction, about performance of students and about qualifications of faculty and, finally, on the acquiescence of students.

In the case of students, the lack of opposition to the new decision-making arrangements should not be interpreted as enthusiastic support. Rather, it seems to have rested on the belief that students could protect themselves against excessive exercise of the new powers of faculty by tacit agreement among themselves that modest levels of academic performance, if enforced by the student culture, protected all. Thus, the gentlemen's "c" and other devices were developed by students as counterbalances to the new power of faculty.

Such reactions of students were workable because grades assigned by faculty and recommendations made by faculty played a small part in determining opportunities available to students after completing their collegiate work. Prospective employers and graduate schools had not yet instituted the practice of securing detailed information about individuals and using that information to make crucial decisions with regard to job offers and acceptance for advanced study.

Having accommodated itself to a major development in faculty life by partially meeting the new demands for faculty control over instructional decisions, the highest authority in

the college was protected from serious challenge of the basic characteristic of academic government; i.e., that legal power rested in an external group (trustees) and not in the hands of those most closely connected with and most fully informed about the college.

It is true, of course, that individual voices continued to urge that American college government should be changed to place legal authority for the institutions in the hands of professors and the arrangements at Oxford and Cambridge universities were sometimes cited as models which should be emulated in America, but such proposals were seldom given serious support.

The trustees and the chief college administrators continued to exercise their authority over the allocations of financial resources without serious challenge. While faculty, individually and in groups, offered advice on budgetary matters and on occasion protested adverse trustee decisions with vehemence, most faculty were content to allow others to make major financial decisions if they were allowed to make academic decisions.[3] Thus, trustees increasingly gave their attention to securing resources for the college, to making allocations (at least in broad categories) of available resources, to securing land for expansion of physical plant and to the designing of buildings. In all these matters they used the president as the principal source of information and perspective.

Students occasionally chafed under the system which conferred virtually no power on them and which, in the main, was not even responsive to their views on more informal bases. But the general acceptance by students of their importance in academic government was apparently the result of a sense by them that the society believed them incapable of participation in decision-making and, has been noted above, to the fact that they had subtle ways of resisting faculty and administrative dominance in formal govern-

[3] These understandings continue to operate in the modern college and university (see, "The Academic Profession: A Pilot Study," by Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, a report of work done under a National Science Foundation grant, number GS 513, dated March, 1968).

ment; and because college attendance and graduation played a relatively insignificant role in their lives and in the futures to which they aspired. Furthermore, they were subject to severe sanctions by their colleges (including expulsion) if they opposed college regulation, with little recourse to public opinion and almost no protection from the courts.

In summary, the period from 1890 through 1920, saw academic government make considerable adjustment of decision-making processes *without any change in the legal arrangements* which made the college a corporation, or in the instance of tax-supported colleges quasi-independent branches of government. The changes which were made accommodated powerful pressures which flowed from new conceptions of scholarly activity. When the understandings appeared to break down—as in the case of the dismissal of a professor by president or trustees—outside pressure was brought to bear by such agencies as the AAUP to secure redress and to demonstrate that such lapses from understandings could be taken only at considerable risk to the institution.

Academic Government in the Modern College

The fundamental question which must now be faced by colleges and universities is whether a system of government, the roots of which lie in the late 17th and 18th centuries (corporations and external boards) and which made its last major adjustment more than half a century ago, is appropriate for the present period and the immediate future.

An analysis of this question may well start with a discussion of the two factors mentioned in the Princeton report cited above:

1. What is the nature of internal relations among faculty, students and administrators on the campus? and,

2. What is the corporate relation of the college to the society?

If these questions can be answered with a degree of confidence the system of collegiate government may then be criticized in the perspectives provided by the answers, and judgments can be made with respect to needed changes.

Internal Relations in Colleges and Universities

While there is merit in the view that relations among those who live and work on the campus are best described by noting that some persons are students, others are faculty members, others are administrators, etc., and that each group tends to occupy a status in the institution and to have a distinct view of the institution, that form of analysis obscures the fact that within each group wide differences in perspectives and ideology exist. To say that students occupy a common (and low) status position in the college or university and to argue therefore that students have single views of the issues important to the institution, contradicts the empirical evidence of wide differences in value and perspective. Similar differences exist within faculties and to a lesser degree among administrators and staff.

Several recent studies which have collected data from faculty and students on such diverse matters as views of basic purposes of higher education, the degree to which the college or university should be a center for study of the society vs. a center for promoting change in the society, the extent to which decision-making should be shared by all who work or study in the institution, etc., reveal that differences within the groups named above exceed the differences between groups on most questions.

The experience of several colleges and universities caught in the midst of "crises" also reveals that the common assumption of cohesive points of view within the major groups is erroneous. For example, a careful review of the Columbia University crisis of April and May, 1968, shows clearly that not only were the students split on almost every issue, but that faculty were also.[4]

Yet, most plans for academic government appear to rest on the proposition that there are "faculty interests," "student interests," etc. Thus, colleges and universities typically have faculty legislative bodies and student legislative bodies each of which presumably expresses unitary points of view and

[4] Jerry L. Avorn, *Up Against the Ivy Wall*, New York, Atheneum Press, 1969.

each charged with exclusive responsibilities in the process of government.

There is serious doubt as to whether it was ever true that faculties, student bodies, etc., had distinct perspectives in colleges and universities, but, whatever may have prevailed previously, no such assumption can be currently justified.

A principal characteristic of internal relations in the contemporary college and university, then, is that on almost every substantial question to be decided by the institution—Who shall be admitted? Shall a "Black Studies" curriculum be established? What government funding should be accepted? etc.,—the perspectives held by individuals are more likely to flow from pre-collegiate or extra-collegiate experience, patterns of association in the institution, socio-economic background, vocational and professional affiliations and personality needs than they are to be the result of status in the institutions.[5]

This development is, no doubt, in part a function of the decline of formality in the relations between faculty and students which has occurred since the World War II. In addition, it is related to the urgency that Americans, especially faculty members and students, ascribe to political and social issues.

In contrast with the student and faculty interests suggested above, presidents and trustees appear to function more on the basis of perspectives which flow from status positions. At any rate, it can hardly be argued that presidents or trustees have sufficient contact with faculty or students to form a connection with the political cultures of the campus. A recent study of college trustees, for example, indicates that their social and political perspectives are clearly distinct from major groups of faculty and students.[6]

---

[5] The fact that some of these factors may be associated with age of individuals and rank in the institution means, of course, that certain groups may *tend* to express conservative or liberal views of specific issues under consideration. For example, senior professors have a tendency to express more conservative views on some issues. The point, however, is that differences of viewpoint exist within each status group and on some issues status hardly seems to affect perspective at all.

[6] Rodney T. Hartnett, *College and University Trustees: Their Back-*

Permeating the nature of internal relationships in colleges and universities is a fundamentally new concept of the jurisdiction of the institution over the speech and actions of those associated with it. In earlier periods of our history it seemed appropriate and "right" that students should be under the control of the college which could then carry out its responsibilities for education and for moral guidance. The basis for the exercise of comprehensive supervision of students—on-campus and off—rested in the British common law principle of *in loco parentis.*

The usual application of this principle gave colleges and universities broad latitude in prescribing acceptable behavior of students, and most who appealed for relief even from arbitrarily or maliciously administered rules found courts unwilling to hear their cases.

Until this century, and in some colleges until recent days, faculty, too, were obliged to fashion their lives in harmony with the preferences of trustees and presidents.

The sweeping changes, with regard to the authority of colleges and universities over student life, have clearly narrowed the distinctions between "students" and "citizens."[7] A series of court cases has established that, while colleges may administer such rules as are necessary to their educational functions, standards of *fair play* (procedural due process) must prevail. Furthermore, the courts appear increasingly interested in protecting the constitutional rights of students who engage in free speech and in orderly activities, including demonstrations, to secure redress or grievances. Being a student, in other words, no longer implies relinquishing the rights of citizenship.

Pressures from organizations like the American Association of University Professors, the American Civil Liberties Union, the professional societies, and other voluntary groups have invoked similar changes in the status of faculty.

---

grounds, Roles and Educational Attitudes, Princeton, Educational Testing Service, 1969.

[7] For a recent discussion of these changes, see "Legal Aspects of Student-College Relationships," *Denver Law Journal,* Vol. 54, No. 4, Special Issue 1968.

The relationships between changes outlined above and similar developments aimed at protecting the civil rights of citizens outside colleges and universities seem clear. In one sense, the colleges and universities have been swept by the current of recent social changes into accepting new conceptions of jurisdiction over their members.

One representation of the "jurisdictional question" in college government is the current debate over the extent to which the college or university should take action when students have violated local, state or federal law. Until recently, it was widely assumed that collegiate institutions should take additional action when students were found guilty of violations of civil courts, although at times and in lieu of public prosecution the courts allowed the college the right to punish student violators. But these practices are now widely questioned, and a new policy in dealing with civil offenses appears to be rising: for example, a recent report on these matters argues that:

> The fact of illegal activity by a student neither mandates nor precludes University jurisdiction. Cornell's responsibility for student misconduct differs from that of the society, and is confined to its special interests as an educational community. University inaction because of lack of jurisdiction over the offense in no way implies University condonation of the offense or of any principle of law violation.[8]

A third characteristic of internal relations on college and university campuses is the growing differentiation of governmental functions. In earlier days, faculty and presidents performed most, if not all, of the "administrative" functions in addition to their teaching responsibilities. As these administrative functions became more specialized and more technical and the instructional functions of faculty more time-consuming, the practice of adding staff who performed such functions as the admission of students, recordkeeping, counseling, etc., grew. An executive (bureaucratic) arm of colle-

---

[8] Report of University Commission on the Interdependence of University Regulations and Local, State and Federal Law, *Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. (mimeographed) Page iii, submitted to President Perkins under date of September 27, 1967.*

giate government emerged and came to have a crucial effect on internal relations.

In contrast with many faculty and students, administrative staff (at least at the upper levels) focus their loyalties on the institution. They tend, therefore, to support institutional stability, resisting activities which disrupt quiet functioning. Having a perspective which differs from faculty and students and occupying a status which is marginal to the manifest goals of the institution—teaching and research—administrative staff often develops a system of values distinct from, and sometimes dysfunctional to, the academic-intellectual activities of students and faculty. In these ways the bureaucracy takes on a life of its own, erects defenses against encroachment on its prerogatives, and attempts to use the fragmentation of the political culture[9] to its advantage.

It is the fragmentation of the political culture of the campus into relatively small groups which cut across status lines that makes the old approach to collegiate government ineffective. Student governments and faculty senates could in previous days, be said to represent relatively cohesive perspectives and it was possible for presidents to negotiate with these groups with assurance that agreements would be accepted by most of the constituencies. But the old values which were the basis of the cohesive perspectives are now in question: the "professional" values which dominated faculty perspectives are now subject to serious challenge from within the faculty[10] and the elitest-play perspectives of the student culture are in disrepute.[11]

---

[9] Political Culture: The pattern of individual attitudes and orientations among the members of a political system. Such orientations involve knowledge of the way the system operates, feelings of allegiance and/or alienation toward the system and judgments about the consistency of the values of the political system with one's own value commitments.

[10] See *The Antioch Review*, Fall 1969, for representative statement of the dissension within faculty groups.

[11] The disintegration of the student culture into factions—the several parts of the "new left," the black students, the Young Americans for Freedom, etc.—is well known as is the fact that the disintegration has made student government important and the object of scorn among students. For a brief discussion of the contrast between the

So long as the professional perspectives of the faculty and the elitest-play perspectives of the students were accepted by a majority of both groups, it was possible to govern the college by accommodating these interests and by negotiating differences between their perspectives and the perspectives of boards and presidents. It could be safely assumed that most recruits—freshman students and new faculty—would accept the prevailing values and support the political culture.

It is the intrusion of new value questions which cannot be accommodated within the old perspectives that makes the system inoperative. When faculty are asked to consider the values of professionalism—departmental autonomy, more time and facilities for research, etc.—in relation to the needs of minority students for remedial instruction, community needs for housing and jobs, etc., value conflict overwhelms the cohesion. When the elitist-play values of the student culture are challenged by student critics who argue that such values support a system of social and racial injustice and of class privilege, little or no defense of the old values is offered.

It is understandable that many presidents, faculty and students would prefer not to face these new and potentially shattering developments: which is why modest reforms in collegiate government are supported by so many. Then, too, there is the hope that the present difficulties will be temporary and that we will soon "return to normal:" which is to say that the value question "What is the purpose of the university?" need not be faced. That hope appears a slender reed on which to depend for survival.

What is more likely is that the colleges and universities will be active centers in the resolution of value conflicts in the society at large: "The university is the place where some of the most important contradictions and tensions of modern society are at their most concentrated and explosive. [sic]"[12]

---

current state of affairs and the 1930's see, "Culture, Politics and the Dean of Students," W. Max Wise, in *Conflict and Change in the Academic Community*, Detroit, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1970.

[12] Stanley Hoffman, "Participation in Perspective," *Daedalus*, Winter 1970, p. 179.

The foregoing analysis of internal relations in colleges and universities has at least four implications for academic government:

1. While some accommodation to interests which flow from status differences may need to be made by establishing "student committees" and "faculty committees," the principal issues in collegiate institutions are not likely to be debated and resolved in such structures. Hence, new structures are required.

2. The pragmatic problem for these institutions is to move toward new governmental structures and procedures while keeping the places from coming apart. Since we are not sure how the value debates are to be resolved in academia, i.e., what new purposes the university will assume, it is premature to make firm decisions on governance. Above all, the fact that it is fundamentals (purposes) that are in question, not simply feelings of being excluded from participation, must be kept in mind. That is to say, those who argue that if students and younger faculty are brought into the present structures of academic government, much will be resolved because their psychological needs will be met are reciting a partial truth, but are missing the main truth. The value differences are real and are not likely to yield to the enticements offered by joining the inner circle of decision-makers unless the nature of the decisions is also affected.

3. The competency of collegiate government to deal with student and faculty violations of civil law is being challenged, and the procedures under which college rules are administered are the subject of scrutiny by the courts. Collegiate government is under pressure to restrict its jurisdiction to those matters of conduct which *directly* affect the educational functions.

4. The re-incorporation of administrative staff into the vital centers of faculty and student life is a major task for reform of collegiate government. To do so may require the revision of customary procedures for appointment of such officers.

Corporate Relations of the College to the Society

The American college and university has come to occupy a place in the society which could hardly have been visualized a half century ago. Not only are the universities the principal focus of activity intended to produce the new knowledge required by our complex, technocratic society, but enrollment in colleges and universities has become the basis of a social classification system which increasingly divides the American people. Except for race, perhaps no social fact so distinguishes Americans one from another than the answer to the question, "Have you gone to college?"

The connections between this answer and acceptance into new job and social opportunities are now so apparent as to require little elaboration. As Galbraith, Bazelon and others have made clear in recent statements, the new society has a voracious appetite for the college trained and the basis of social and economic advancement no longer rests primarily on the inheritance of property and wealth, but on academic credentials.

In addition, the society believes that the academic enterprise provides the best, if not the only, hope for answers to our pressing social, economic and technological problems. The usual action when bewildering problems of the society are considered is to ask the "expert"—almost always the highly educated and often the college professor—to study the problems to discover its roots and to propose solutions which may then be considered by agencies of government or by private groups.

These recent developments have converted questions of policy and purpose in higher education from what were once essentially *private questions*, which could be left to the private deliberations of trustees, presidents and faculties, to *public questions* because they impinge so centrally on the public interest and hopes of individuals for social and economic advancement.

What previously could be safely left to restricted groups working in private within the academic enterprise—because the decisions were seldom crucial to large numbers of persons

or to the society—now must be considered by larger and more plural groups.

For example, the question of whom to admit to programs of study appeared until recently to be a matter better left in the hands of the faculty (they usually set the policy and left the administration to an office of admissions). But since admission to college has come to have such a profound effect on opportunities for social and economic advancement in the society, and since the usual faculty policies exclude large proportions of individuals from low income families and from some minority groups, it was inevitable that the faculty prerogatives in these matters would be challanged. The resistance of faculty to these challenges on the ground that their control over admissions substituted merit (academic aptitude) for social privilege (membership in wealthy families) as the criterion for admission is in conflict with the observable social effects of the new policy.[13]

The use of academic aptitudes as the major criterion for admissions satisfied middle-class Americans and members of previously excluded minorities (Jews, for example) who could meet the criteria. But it failed to meet the objections of Americans with long standing complaints against the American society and its social institutions—blacks, Spanish speak-

[13] The usual application of "academic aptitude"—high school rank and/or scholastic aptitude test scores—has several shortcomings which were ignored by faculty:

a. The indices of academic aptitude have a positive but low correlation with performance (grade average) in college. The typical correlations, r. equals .4 to .6, indicates that such indices account for sixteen to thirty-six per cent of the variability in academic performance. In addition, the criterion (college grade average) has been consistently found to have a very low, sometimes even negative, relationship with the quality of post-college performance in the professional fields. Thus, college admissions policies are open to severe criticism even within the narrow perspective which has dominated the faculties.

b. As *social policy*, i.e., as an exercise of the public trust, admission practices are even more inadequate because they have effectively excluded the poor in general, blacks, Puerto Ricans, American Indians and others from opportunities for advancement in the society. For example, a national study of college entrance of high school graduates in the early 1960's showed that socio-economic status was a powerful factor in college admissions. When the college entrance rate of high ability—top 20 per cent—youth was investigated, those from well-to-do, socially prominent families entered college at a rate which was 2½ times that of equally qualified youth from poor, socially obscure families.

ing groups and the very poor—and the faculty admissions policies came to epitomize discrimination against such persons.

The processes of decision-making, which have survived from the previous period, make only limited provisions for adequate deliberations of *public policy*. Boards of trustees and faculty senates often consist of self-perpetuating groups of like-minded persons, almost always conducting their deliberations in closed sessions. Boards of tax-supported institutions, while seldom self-perpetuating, emulate many of the habitual procedures of those in private colleges and universities.

Furthermore, the data on American college trustees, to which reference has already been made, suggest strongly that the social and educational perspectives of trustees are extremely limited, substantiating the argument that open processes are necessary to inform the trustees of views that contrast with their own. Even when the affairs of collegiate institutions, whether tax-supported or independent, are conducted in the public interest, this does not relieve the need to make the procedures more explicitly open. That is, not only the quality of decisions is in question, but the procedures as well: "good" decisions taken in private are likely to be suspect.

This discussion of the corporate relations of the college to the society has the following implications for collegiate government:

1. There is a mounting body of evidence that suggests that the decisions facing colleges and universities in the immediate future will be taken in the midst of very difficult circumstances:

a. The present debate over the degree to which institutions of higher education should engage in social action in contrast with more reflective purposes is far from resolved;

b. college and universities will undoubtedly be called upon, by persons from social groups which until now have been deprived of adequate opportunity for self-development, to develop new procedures and new responses to replace

those which cannot be adapted rapidly enough to serve the immediate needs of these emerging groups;

c. having moved from a marginal position in the society to a position of central importance to social, economic and ethical concerns of the nation, colleges and universities will be active participants in the struggle to improve the *quality* of the common life and, finally;

d. all of these matters will be decided during a period in which budget decisions are likely to grow increasingly complex and difficult, requiring institutions to support certain desirable activities, while others, equally desirable, go unsupported.

2. Many of the matters about which collegiate government must decide involve grave tests of strength and legitimacy because they involve severely sanctioned choices; the issues strike at central characteristics of the institutions. The decisions will affect the status and group interests of persons associated with the college or university. As has already been demonstrated during the past few years, individuals and groups of students and faculty are likely to contest whatever decisions are made by using the more traditional forms of political expressions-discussion: organization of pressure groups, the exercise of voting rights to elect representatives to legislative bodies as well as the "new politics" of confrontation and civil disobedience.

3. Collegiate government faces still another challenge to its integrity. There is increasing doubt, on the part of the public and the statutory and regulatory bodies representing the public, about the competency of collegiate government to deal responsibly with issues confronting it and about its ability to muster the allegiance of students and faculty to support its decisions. Such doubts arise from the impression that decisions often appear to protect the interests of the institution and its more powerful members rather than to serve the needs of the society. Finally, doubts about the ability of collegiate government to secure the "consent of the governed" are, of course, based on recent evidence to the contrary.

An Approach to the Revival of Academic Government

A necessary pre-condition for the restoration of functioning government in colleges and universities is the recognition of the sources of its difficulties. And it is precisely at this point that administrators, trustees, faculty, and most students exhibit an unwillingness to face reality. To face reality would require a recognition that the debate over purposes has barely begun; that the fragmentation of the campus political culture must be faced directly; that the old agreements on division of responsibility among trustees, presidents, faculty and students no longer hold; and finally that leadership in the institutions faces a crisis of confidence which renders it impotent. In short, what must be faced is the demise of old political processes which were once adequate, but which cannot now deal with the new constellations of competing pressures on decision-making structures.

But, as Hoffman has noted, the university (and the college):

> . . . is probably the only institution that recoils before the notion that it is a political system. To me, an institution is a political system as soon as there is conflict over ends and over how power should be arranged to reach them. Yet, most academic and university administrators reject the idea with indignation (and thus, resist the notion and practice of leadership), partly because of the hollowed but false notion that the business of the university is truth, and truth and power are incompatible; partly because of the fear of external manipulation and internal chicanery which the word, politics, invokes. Knowledge, alas, has not only its sociology but also its politics. As long as there is unwillingness to recognize reality, there can be no realistic way of preventing the conflicts from wrecking the university; for the task ahead is not the suppression of conflict, the achievement of the seductive dream of total harmony in community, but the management of conflict and its channeling in such a way that it can gradually be resolved.[14]

Hoffman's thesis, that academics reject the notion that the college or university may profitably be viewed as a political system, was confirmed by the reactions to a recent publication on collegiate government entitled *The Politics of*

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 197-198.

the Private College (W. Max Wise, Hazen, 1968). While noting that the essay described the way colleges operate, three quarters of the comments criticized the use of the word *politics* in the title.

But the problems of collegiate government involve precisely those matters on which political analysis focuses: *patterns of human association which involve to a significant extent, power, rule and authority* (from Robert Dahl, *A Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1963). When that reality is faced, certain approaches to the restoration of effective academic government suggest themselves:

1. Most, if not all, bodies which deliberate policy and purposes, should be more accessible to individuals and groups which wish to express opinion. That is, the present tendency for committees, senates and boards to meet in private should be abandoned.

The new procedures which should be initiated include the use of "open hearings" by groups which consider questions of importance and the admission of observers to formal meetings of boards, faculty senates, etc.

These changes are intended to remedy a serious problem which now plagues decision-making in colleges and universities; namely that the "uninvolved" (which includes most faculty and students) lack confidence in the groups charged with responsibility. As Dykes[15] has reported, there is a discrepancy between faculty perceptions of their roles in decision-making and the reality. He reports that faculty feel they have not been consulted when in fact they have, etc. Other observations confirm a similar situation with respect to students.

2. As a further aid to increasing campus understanding of and confidence in decision-making procedures, new communication procedures must be established to provide contemporary and reliable information on the discussions of policy alternatives. To leave printed communications in the

[15] Archie R. Dykes, *Faculty Participation in Academic Decision-Making*, Washington, American Council on Education, 1968.

hands of the student newspaper, as is common, is clearly unwise: not only are important activities ignored, but student reporters (and editors) have a tendency to view these events through special "lenses."

But, the typical newsletters, which are published by institutions, suffer their own handicaps of bias (real or claimed) and, unless they can be established as independent from presidential preferences, are viewed as unreliable.

3. It is now clear that the principle of division of responsibility which has prevailed for the past few decades, under which trustees dealt with fiscal matters, the faculty dealt with educational policy and students dealt with the extra-curriculum, cannot function in the deliberation and resolution of basic questions of purposes. All major groups have a stake in the decisions and must be included in governmental processes.

One way to deal with the new conditions is to create multi-representational bodies to which the present statutory bodies delegate considerable authority. A striking example of the use of these procedures is the common practice of creating "search" committees with trustee, faculty and student members to fill presidential vacancies. These procedures should be extended to other areas of decision-making.

4. A crucial change in academic government which must be accomplished concerns the new roles which administrators should assume. To put the matter simply, administrative functions and decision-making should be separated.

While administrators may serve on decision-making bodies, their chief roles with respect to these processes should involve the development and interpretation of information needed for decision-making. That is, they should make sure that committees, senates and boards have adequate data on which decisions must rest and they should outline policy alternatives which such bodies may consider along with descriptions of the limitations and gains of possible decisions.

Contrary to the common view that these changes would reduce the authority of administrators, the more likely result would be an increase in their leadership. If they were no longer viewed as the loci or hidden power they would be free

to propose new policies and could more freely influence decision-making bodies.

In addition, their new roles as developers of information for decision-making and as policy proposers would remedy a pervasive deficiency in collegiate government: most boards, senates and committees deliberate in states of relative ignorance with respect to relevant data and therefore consume inordinate amounts of time of the participants.

These interim changes (others will suggest themselves as conditions develop) are designed to remedy the disasterous fragmentation of the campuses into sub-groups which compete for power and authority. Until some degree of political cohesiveness is nurtured, campus government will remain ineffective and the future of these institutions will remain problematic.

III.

Organization and Administration of a University: A Philosopher's Perspective

Henry Margenau *

Organization and administration of a University are not subjects on which I can speak with professional competence or, indeed, with any degree of confidence, for I have never been active in the august administrative realm. This article therefore presented a major challenge which I meet with some trepidation. In order to ease my mind and to provide you with better facilities for judging the merit of my comments I shall state first on what personal grounds they have found their formulation.

As a veteran teacher of physics and philosophy, exposed to the machinations of administrators from above and to the eager questioning of students from a stratum of activities that used to be, but is no longer, designated as below, I have over a period of several decades developed a series of convictions and grievances which bear upon the problems of this discourse. For the most part they are related to curricular matters and to methods of teaching. A few suggestions flow from my experience as a college trustee.

* Professor of Physics, Yale University.

If my remarks should betray a bias against the humanities, you must forgive it in view of my preoccupation with the sciences. However, as a teacher of both physics and philosophy, and therefore one who has had to bridge the gulf between the two cultures in numerous college courses and seminars, I earnestly draw your attention to the pertinence of this unfortunate cleavage with respect to the problems which baffle most Western universities. It is true, our entire culture suffers from this schizophrenia, and some of the troubles in our universities clearly reflect that malady. But since the universities have treated and are perpetuating it throughout our society, since they are both propagating agents and patients of the disease, some attention must be given to it in the sequel. For this, then, the peculiarities of my experience may be an advantage.

We shall be dealing primarily with American education. Here again, my expertise may be questionable and my preparation far from orthodox, for I have spent about one third of my life abroad. However, I did have the opportunity of teaching abroad, both in Europe and in Asia, and these episodes have influenced my judgment of American colleges. They have forced me, for example, to renounce the chauvinism which asserts that all phases of American education are the best in the world and that therefore we must not try to learn from others. They have engendered in me a loathing for the teaching of history which dwells upon the greatness of one's fatherland and has no other purpose than to instill that questionable virtue, patriotism, when such instruction could equally well contribute to a sympathetic understanding of other nations.

Finally, I must confess to the perhaps prejudicial belief that the importance of our universities in modern society is no longer what it used to be. Organized schools in general have lost part of their educational efficacy to the news and entertainment media, and unless this situation is recognized every attempt at reorganization of the university is futile. In fact it seems questionable whether any measure which affects the university alone can be fruitful in our day.

The title of these seminars has clearly been chosen in the

expectation that the university as an educational institution will survive. Some will challenge this assumption because they view the social-political revolution which engulfs us at present as the beginning of a radical process of distinctive innovation. It is indeed easy to underestimate the vigor of the convulsions that are taking place in social, political, and legal areas; one shudders when reading the sums spent for safeguarding the lives of American Presidents who, perhaps for the first time in our history, consider themselves forced to avoid informal social contacts with their people for the sake of personal safety. One wonders if, upon the American calendar, this might be the year 1916 of the Russian revolution, when things were still fairly normal except for sporadic riots and disorders which the established authorities tried to curb by remedial, legal and administrative measures. Yet, concerning them, Dr. Zhivago's friend has this to say:

> What you call disorder is just as normal a state of things as the order you're so keen about. All this destruction—it's a natural preliminary stage of a broad creative plan. Society has not yet disintegrated sufficiently. It must fall to pieces completely, then a genuine revolutionary government will put the pieces together and build on completely new foundations.[1]

I have heard similar speeches made by Black Panthers and by SDS students, the latter changing the word government to "university governance." Let me say that I don't believe a word of these calamitous prophecies, and for two reasons. First, history is never a safe ground for specific predictions—more on this in the following—and second, our present situation is very different from the one upon which this comparison draws, in fact from any known to history: ours involves not merely economic, political and religious, but conscious moral elements, which makes it so far as can be seen unique. And even if this reasoning were false, there is still the historical fact that the Russian university did survive the revolution. It survived, strange to say, in a form not greatly different from the old.

Hence I am willing to assume with confidence that the

[1] Boris Pasternak, *Dr. Zhivago*. New York: Pantheon Press, 1958.

university will not fall prey to the revolutionary forces of our time, and I attack my subject with the feeling that I am not attempting a useless task.

The first part of this lecture is devoted to a brief analysis and a summary of the causes of student unrest. The second and central portion will deal with those causes which seem to be common to all instances of activism both here and abroad: irrelevance of subject matter and inadequacy of teaching methods. Fortunately these are matters capable of correction by academic people like ourselves. A few words will finally be said about the problem of "governance," that loathsome noun which, begotten by a legal mind, now walks on stilts through all the halls of academia. Preparation for this talk included the reading of the winter issue of Daedalus, entitled "The Embattled University." It was memorable because of its fine prose and its contentment with faceless generalities; it led me to the conclusion that perhaps more concrete things ought to be said and that I, having lost my academic status by retirement, run no risk in being specific, frank, forthright and contradictable. It is indeed my hope that this talk, labelled a seminar, will invite your suggestions and corrections.

Some Causes of Student Dissatisfaction with Present University Procedures.

A university is the embodiment of an innate and irremovable conflict, the antagonism between what immature students want and what more knowledgeable and presumably wiser teachers think they ought to get. Once these coincide, once the wolf lies down with the lamb, even the idea of a university, and the gist as well as the literal meaning of the word "education" will have been destroyed. Let me repeat: it is normal and necessary for this conflict to exist. What ails the present academic scene is a) wide-spread failure to recognize this obvious truth and b) a needless sharpening of this conflict, a needless widening of the valley between the students' wants and the teachers' willingness. Nothing can be done about point a) except restatement and unremitting

emphasis. Point b), however, requires analysis and action. For it is clear that teachers and administrators ought to meet those student demands which are reasonable. Let us therefore look at currently voiced dissatisfactions; and it will be helpful at first to take a global view.

For the amazing fact is that unrest among students is worldwide and yet the substantial causes differ from place to place.

In the U.S. they are probably most complex. First and foremost, it seems to me, is a rejection of a (stupid) war which offends moral sensibilities and produces among the undrafted an uneasy, guiltlike feeling of enjoying a college sanctuary which they seek but nevertheless resent as unfair. This resentment is understandably increased when youth's honest voices are met with the official posture of the Japanese monkey which closes eyes and ears while muttering vaguely about a silent but uncounted and unidentified majority. Next comes the race problem with all its moral implications and political acerbities. There is condemnation of the aloofness of the faculty, its isolation in ivory or ebony towers, and lastly a feeling that much of the material taught is without value in the modern scene. This last complaint is somewhat localized in certain disciplines and is characteristically absent in the physical sciences. Political indoctrination is of relatively small importance on American campuses. The assertion of its presence comes partly from individuals who see the cause of every evil, here and abroad, mundane and supernatural, in the agitation of communists. On the other hand, wishful thinking on the part of leftist wishers often portrays student militancy as healthful agitation against a political conservatism. It seems to me that analyses like Cohn-Bendit's *Obsolete Communism, The Left-Wing Alternative* and Cockburn & Blackburn's *Student Power* are not wholly applicable to the U.S. locale because they overplay the political motive. More than anyone else, American youth is having a spree of kicking the slats out of the cradle.

In France, where activist movements are strong and have manifestations (locking up deans, etc.) similar to ours, the first two causes mentioned above, war and race conflict, are

evidently absent; the other two are clearly present and are joined by a fifth resentment: many young people having acquired their *bacheau* and therefore eligible to enter a university cannot be accepted because of a serious shortage of facilities and buildings, as well as professors. In this last respect the situation differs markedly from the U.S. political activism is noticeable, but perhaps subordinate to the other causes.

German academic unrest has a stronger political undertone, some of it occasioned by a concern with Maoism of which few Americans are aware. The causes active in France are likewise operative, perhaps with the exception of a shortage of facilities, which is being corrected (as it is partly in France) by the establishment of new university campuses. Added to this, however, is dissatisfaction with the lecture system and with the lordly manner in which professional recruits are chosen.

Most of these statements hold for Japan, the last two perhaps with strong accentuation. After watching a student demonstration in Tokyo I asked one of the demonstrators, a member of the class I was teaching, for his and his colleagues' complaint. Expecting a political diatribe—for the newspapers said that the demonstrators were *zengakurmen*, i.e., a certain extreme brand of radicals—I was surprised to hear an answer approximately like this. Most of us have no strong political feelings. We simply need opportunities for self-expression. In the university we are not allowed to open our mouths; hence we are compelled to make ourselves heard in the streets. In addition to this understandable complaint I sensed a suppressed animus against the encroachment of Western ways.

There have been reports of student unrest in the Soviet Union. Of these I shall not speak because I have no first-hand knowledge of them. While there I met only physics students, and they seemed happy in their work.

The prime questions raised by this survey are clearly these. Why do we witness almost identical academic disturbances everywhere? Conditions and grievances differ greatly from country to country. How can such different causes produce the same effects in widely different places at the same time in

history? The answer is to be found in our shrinking world, in the speed of reaction and the sensationalism of our communications industries. News media, especially TV, instantly broadcast and amplify every social anomaly into an impressive event, make heroes out of rioters, excite the uncommitted to action and show the innocent how it's done.

The answer is not very helpful to the university teacher and administrator who has no control over the news and entertainment networks. But it distributes culpability and it should lessen the breast pounding in the academic community. Its positive implication is the lowly one that we, in order to keep matters from going out of hand, must seek the understanding and the cooperation of reporters. And there is one other lesson we may draw from this observation. The causes of unrest in the U.S. are multiple, as we have seen. Each group of students bears its own protest in the confusing crescendo of voices. It is therefore unreasonable on the part of the administration and faculty to expect a uniform, constructive and useful set of recommendations from students, whose demands do not make total sense. Their specific complaints may be real enough; but an integrative response to them is well nigh impossible.

From such general considerations we now turn to those reputed defects of the university system which are common to activist demonstrations everywhere and plague in particular the colleges of the United States. Fortunately, they represent matters capable of correction by educators alone. I am speaking of the lack of current significance in some of the subjects taught and of some faults in our methods of teaching, of substance and form of the educational process.

University Curricula

There are reasons why, aside from their intrinsic importance, the subjects now taught may come under closer scrutiny in the near future, as the student revolt moves on. Clark Kerr (The Embattled University, *Daedalus*, Winter, 1970, p. 112) points out that students' attention is turning toward the faculty and its role:

> Earlier they had asked for more freedom for themselves; now they wish to reduce the established authority of others. This is a harder challenge. The initial loser before this new force is the dean of students and then the president; before long, it may be the faculty. The sharpest challenges may come to be between the faculty which once supported the students against the administration and the students who, having disposed of the administration as an intervening power, directly confront the faculty.

At that time teachers will have to give an account of what and how they teach.

In assessing the adequacy of a curriculum, which, as mentioned, will always be a compromise between what students want and what professors deem important, the latter must listen to the clamor of the former. Since this clamor is a babel of voices, difficult to understand, a statistical approach seems to be suggested. It would aim to ascertain where, in what disciplines the decibels are highest. That information might then allow us to single out special areas of study for primary scrutiny in the hope of finding there obsolete materials or emphases which are candidates for elimination and replacement. I propose to take this approach. But unfortunately it will involve subjective elements, personal observations for, strange as it may seem, my search has not yielded the statistics required. What will be reported is therefore a series of impressions gained and confirmed by a number of observers. According to these estimates the noise level decreases as we pass from the arts to history, to philosophy, to behavioral science and finally to the exact and the life sciences, where the din is hardly perceptible. Subjects omitted in this list, notably the preprofessional branches such as engineering and premedicine, are not wholly exempt from disturbances but will not be included in my list. Nor shall I speak of the arts, where unrest is perhaps as severe as anywhere. I omit them for two reasons. One is my own incompetence, the other the suspicion that here, especially in the field of playwriting and acting, the responsiveness of university departments to the rapidly changing tastes and mores of society is so acute and dominant that any internal reform which a teacher might suggest is practically meaningless.

What follows, then, is based on the supposition that students who collectively find fault with their major subject should be taken seriously. This supposition is not infallible, for it is also true that students with a mission are predisposed to enter the disciplines just named, so that the proposed discussion would mistake effects for causes. This is surely true to an extent, and it reduces the cogency of the remarks that follow. But there remains, I think, at least a core of substance in the affirmation that unrest betokens dissatisfaction with what is taught.

History is the first subject under scrutiny. Nobody doubts that it is pleasing, interesting, and edifying. However, if these were its only assets, it ought to play a role in the curriculum similar to poetry and music. Somehow, liberal education regards historical erudition together with competence in English as its favorite offspring, as the *sine qua non* of every claim to humanism. The toughminded younger generation, however, asks with increasing urgency about the utility of history, as taught at present, in today's world. They tend to argue that our situation is unique and that history holds no lessons for the present management of human affairs, nor effective guidelines for the future. The predictive power of history is drawn into question.

Their point can be made numerically explicit by a simple example drawn from the history of ballistics. Primitive man doubtless threw his first stones by hand. He then invented the slingshot, which increased the power of his arm by a factor less than ten. Next came the bow and arrow; it multiplied the ballistic power of the sling shot by less than ten. TNT introduced a factor about equal to ten. One might grant that the development of gunnery up to that point was a fairly continuous sequence of stages, each providing a model which allowed reasonably accurate prediction of happenings at the subsequent stage. Then came the discovery of nuclear energy, which multiplied the power output of TNT by something like one million. It may well be contended that a discontinuity occurred when this happened, that all previous models failed to anticipate even the physical phenomena in this latest realm, let alone their social and political conse-

quences. The new situation differed qualitatively from its predecessors, and the novelty that emerged had no historical antecedent.

I believe in the essential correctness of this conclusion, fully aware that it is no longer heretical since many historians have granted the predictive impotence of the study of history. It is not clear, however, that the teaching of the subject conveys this message. Certainly it has not come through to our politicians, most of whom are steeped in the lore of American history and jurisprudence and project their attitudes into the future.

Nevertheless the view which, on these grounds, deprives history of all utility is evidently false. For situations do sometimes repeat, and when they do prospective inferences may be drawn. This is especially true with respect to *failures* of attempted social, economic or political regulation, which are liable to being repeated by those ignorant of history. The correct philosophic version of the predictive potency of history, presented elsewhere,[2] appears to me to be this. Predictability in science is based upon the validity of strictly causal laws. In that field we have recently come to recognize a peculiar kind of feedback between what comes to be known and what happens;[3] an observation may alter what is being observed. Precisely at this point it was discovered that strict causality lost its control over the atomic domain in which such feedback occurred, and as a result prediction became a statistical process: how an electron will behave in the future can be known with probability only, and this probability is determined, not by a single present observation but by an aggregate of many. Now history, and every phase of behavioral science, is manifestly an arena of a similar feedback, where what is known and intended alters what is. Hence here, too, the statistical method of prediction is required, and this means that a single historical episode does not guarantee its repetition. But if a large number of similar

[2] H. Margenau, "Physical vs. Historical Reality," *Philosophy of Science*, 19, 193, 1952.

[3] For example, as in Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.

episodes of the past is surveyed the outcome of a given, present one can be predicted with probability, though not with certainty. This theory explains why a unique situation, such as the one featuring the first use of atomic energy, is unrelated to any other in the sense of causal history.

What consequences can be drawn from these considerations with respect to the teaching of history? The first is an alarming and radical one: If the past does not significantly determine the future, the reverence for institutions, creeds and documents that have served us in the past may be out of place. Tradition should be shown to be what it is, and encrusted set of values and mores which explains to some extent what we are, and if there is something wrong with what we are, tradition might have to be blamed instead of being honored. Even such sacred documents as the American constitution should not be exempt from critical scrutiny at a time when values are under serious review.

Once the limited predictive power of history is recognized, teaching in that subject may well pursue objectives it is more likely to achieve. As before, it should concentrate on aspects of appeal and edification, but not in the parochial manner that merely inflates the national ego. Indeed nothing is more salutary in today's era of international mistrust than increased emphasis upon the history of nations whose culture is greatly different from ours or whose ideological creeds contradict our own. Fortunately there is movement in this direction in larger universities and colleges; this needs to be broadened and accelerated.

There are other ways in which history can be used to open windows upon the world. The introduction of courses in black history comes to mind. But any other specialty can be viewed from the perspective of history; there is nothing in the conduct of wars or in the succession of political institutions which makes them the subject of history *par excellence*. Indeed political history should be subordinate to the history of ideas, coordinate with history of religion, art and science. The schistocephalic formation of separate departments of history of science and technology in numerous American universities is both anomalous and unfortunate, suggesting

that administrative expediency takes precedence over the dictates of a reasonable philosophy of education.

Many of the strictures I have voiced apply equally to the teaching of philosophy, for the philosopher, too, is prone to identify what is old with what is classical. To speak quite bluntly, the philosophy of ancient Greece has very little material relevance for today, certainly no more than ancient Hindu writings. Nevertheless we place upon Socrates, Plato and Aristotle a ridiculous measure of stress and reverence. A contemporary major in philosophy is certain to have studied Plato's dialogues, which are impressive literature to be sure, while the writings of Cassirer, Teilhard de Chardin, Einstein and Heisenberg, who have made major inroads into current philosophic thinking, are specialties to which a few misguided modernists pay close attention.

Perhaps the most important philosophical discovery of the modern age is the elusiveness of ultimate or perennial truth. Human understanding is tied to axioms or postulates for which there exists no prior logical warrant. The story that science, or anything else in the world, is based on absolutely and inflexibly certain knowledge is no longer believed. In simple outline, the human mind confronts the following situation: At one end of the knowledge range it finds the facts, which are in themselves unordered, crude, qualitative and meaningless. At the other end of the range stand theoretical postulates, created by man in the hope of explaining the facts, of illuminating them with meanings. And if the consequences of the postulates, called principles, laws or theories, meet the facts in veridical fashion, i.e., explain or predict them, the postulates are accepted for the time being as descriptive of reality. But as time goes on, as human experience grows, new facts emerge or old facts are altered, and this necessitates a revision or sometimes a rejection of the postulational basis of knowledge; to put it simply, it alters reality.

A bold statement like the foregoing irks some of my philosophic colleagues. They have not broken with past shibboleths, they still have one foot in their fairy-tale world of absolute truth and claim to believe in its existence but put it beyond the finite reach of man. Hence they want me to say

that discovery of new facts with consequent readjustment of postulates alters, not reality, but our knowledge of reality. I am happy to oblige them, for the change in wording leaves the gist of the matter and our human situation exactly the same. Hence it is wrong to suppose that classical philosophers, ignorant of the facts of today, could satisfactorily meet the present scene. Their primary relevance is literary; their substantial impact is in fields precisely like philosophy, religion and perhaps politics, where progress has been absent or slow. My own respect for Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas, Hume and Kant is occasioned by the profound *questions* they asked, not by their answers. For while there are no eternally valid answers, there are eternal questions. Hence I would honor the classics for their questions, but look to our time for answers. Lest this seem like disrespect, let me say that, whatever philosophy we teach, the classical heritage lives on in our language, for we pay our dues to its heroes whenever we use words like ideas, problems and indeed the term philosophy itself.

All this adds up to the admonition that the philosophic curriculum should be modernized. Along with it I sense the need for some extraversion of philosophic concerns. The inward trend which seized upon ontology and metaphysics as the core of the subject should be reversed—this is in fact already happening—and instead of making *itself* the primary object of its study philosophy ought to be given external goals. What we need today is philosophy of art, of religion, of law, of the specific sciences, of ethics.

I cannot forego a special comment on courses now taught in value theory, moral philosophy and ethics. They deal abstractly with theoretical issues which have grown up in the long history of these subjects. Rarely, it seems, do they come to grips with the moral perplexities and crises of contemporary living. It is important to notice this because of an important element of novelty in our ethical milieu. Our young generation is perhaps the first which has had no explicit instruction in moral principles. In the past this was conveyed through courses in religion, which our laws forbid in public schools; now it is relegated to Sunday schools and minimized

even there. University students, therefore, are largely devoid of solid convictions regarding ethical imperatives, and their exposure to lofty reasoning about Aristotle's virtues, relativity of values and the logical meaning of good is often as useless as the teaching of relativity theory to a person who does not know the law of gravitation. One would urge, therefore, that courses in moral philosophy be given more concrete content, that they use for their analysis living, working ethical systems rather than the writings of professional ethicists.

These considerations bring us close to the behavioral sciences, which share the preoccupation with values. What one finds here is an emphasis on actualities contrasting markedly with the traditional philosopher's attitude. Behaviorism still guides the thinking of most psychologists, and the sociologist studies the ways in which men deport themselves as members of society. All of this is good, and I should be the last to criticize my peers in these fields, which lie far beyond my own. I do, however, have a question which echoes complaints I have heard from students in the social sciences. Suppose, they say, we knew all about how men behave in a given society; suppose even that we were able to predict their actions in terms of objective social laws. Would we then not be precisely at the place of physical sciences which enjoy enormous power of action and prediction, power which can be used for good and evil ends, but is without discrimination as to its use? In other words, how would we know whether the actual behavior of men, even when it is capable of being controlled, is what it *ought* to be?

Thus arises the question of normative principles, or primary values in terms of which actual behavior and the values embodied therein must be appraised. And these, it seems to me, are being neglected. We are in the grips of an identity crisis, caught in a syndrome of realism which ignores the *ought* before the *is*. If this impression is correct, the social sciences should be urged to curb their ultrafactual studies, at least in their curricula, and attend to the ways in which normative principles arise and operate in history and in living cultures. Their ultimate goal might even be a consensus on

what these principles are. Strangely, one sees more of this in the writings of industrial management experts and in textbooks dealing with industrial relations than in the general area of social science. Corporations have come to realize the need for an examination of their goals, as distinct from their actual practices, as a condition for survival. Society at large, and the university in particular, must see it too.

The two-cultures' polarity afflicts our teaching. Students leaning toward the humanities are confirmed in their alignment and often acquire a bias against the sciences; young scientists are rapidly made into specialists, while the undecided youth who wishes to find his way is subject to two streams of persuasion, two established powers fighting for his soul. The result is intellectual schizophrenia.

The cause is partly the absence of intellectual liason between the humanists and the scientists on our campuses. This can only be remedied by an administration which is discriminating in the choice and reward of its professors and is willing to render fluid the rigid boundaries between departments. But the curriculum, too, is in need of critical evaluation on the score of perpetuating the two-culture dualism. The scientist blames the scientific ignorance of the history and philosophy teacher; the reverse accusation holds that science does not provide a liberal education. Both indictments can be substantiated; but since the former is quite frequently discussed in this context and calls for fairly obvious correctives, let us focus upon the latter and consider in what way science can be made a more integral part of a liberal arts curriculum, granting that it falls short of being a part of it now.

My remarks will deal with the physical sciences, although sympathetic colleagues hold that they are applicable to the life sciences as well. I may perhaps be forgiven if I speak more specifically of physics, the subject I have taught.

Here one finds almost no complaints about the upper-class courses. They are largely handled by men who are allowed to teach their specialities and therefore inject into their work the enthusiasm that inspires their research. Furthermore, the students who take these courses have already survived the ordeal of their initial exposure to science, are relatively

tough-skinned and are often less resentful of the pedagogical incompetence of their teachers than a freshman would be. On the whole it seems as though the going was smooth for students who have passed the barrier of the elementary science courses.

Let us now consider these. The usual freshman or sophomore course in physics contains the following subject matter: It begins with mechanics and ends with a conglomeration of facts frequently called "Modern Physics," winding its devious way through such topics as heat, thermodynamics, hydrodynamics, sound, electricity and magnetism, geometrical and physical optics. An elementary course in physics has come to designate all these things; if anything is omitted the course is regarded as incomplete. The unsuspecting student is forced to take this entire melange or nothing.

Most physics teachers have developed an unshakable reverence for the sanctity of the subject matter in an elementary course. A suggestion that part of the material be omitted tends to be treated as heresy, and the fullness of the course is defended by an appeal to deans of engineering schools and medical schools, who, it is said, insist that candidates for admission to their institutions be exposed to all the items of this potpourri. Yet interrogation of these administrative officials leads invariably to the conclusion that medical schools and engineering colleges make no prescription as to the selection of the subject matter in any elementary course in physics and chemistry, that they leave their composition entirely to the discretion of the science teachers. Perhaps this point needs emphasis, for it demolishes the one and only reasonable argument which the propagandist for completeness of subject matter in an elementary course can use to support his position.

The point is that these courses are crammed with a superabundance of uncorrelated facts, uncorrelated at least in the mind of the student who leaves the course. No professor can teach, and no student can absorb in one year, such an overwhelming avalanche of material together with its conceptual connections. This fact, of course, does not escape the perceptive teacher. He has, therefore, invented a remedy

called the inductive method, which he regards as the quintessence of scientific procedure. The method consists in first presenting all the facts, which enter the scene as *dei ex machina.* They are often skillfully introduced by ingenious lecture demonstrations, and thus are made memorable to the students. On the second stage of the inductive method the student must remember, correlate, and learn the use of these facts. And the third stage is an attempt to develop a modicum of theory so that the facts are illuminated by the light of principles. Since time presses there is usually very little opportunity for this last phase of the process to emerge; what happens, therefore, is that theories, laws and mathematical equations are again treated as though they were facts to be memorized, very much without relevance to the first and second stage of the inductive process. In sum, the method may be said to have the following disadvantages: Being inductive, it puts conceptual illumination at the end, and since teachers are always rushed because of the fullness of their courses the end is slighted.

In some cases there is an understandable explanation for the fullness of the elementary science courses. They are supposedly difficult to teach, and the men placed in charge of them are experienced teachers who are often relieved of the necessity and of the opportunity for doing research. In time their knowedge grows eclectic; their approach to their subject becomes general and indiscriminate. Somehow they develop a feeling that in their one yearly contact with an elementary student they must teach him all they know, and in their enthusiastic but massive embrace, the love of the student for the subject is killed.

The remedy for the situation is obvious. Above all it is necessary to ease the overburden of detailed facts in the elementary science courses. Whole segments like thermodynamics, hydrodynamics, and, indeed, optics could be omitted from an elementary physics course without either destroying its continuity or its value, and similar pruning could be undertaken in courses in chemistry. This would leave time for proper digestion of the facts presented, would give an opportunity to discuss, with the students' participation, the

meaning of the new things learned, and would open vistas into other fields, such as biophysics, biochemistry, philosophy and history of science. These are minimum remedies whose desirability seems to me beyond question.

There are also faults with the elementary pedagogy employed in the beginning science courses, faults due to lack of care and attention on the part of their teachers. This criticism, however, extends beyond the subject of physics. One of the saddest plights in our four-year colleges is that of the pre-major, who is nearly always forced into a medley of "general education" courses which are poorly designed because the professional faculty has little interest in them.

Relative to the discussion of subject matter, one last recommendation may not be amiss. It runs counter to most beliefs and customs which control the teaching of the sciences as self-rewarding specialties, but has taken on increasing force in my own experience and amounts to the seemingly bold suggestion that a freshman course in philosophy ought to precede the science courses. That course could be entitled "the role of science in human experience." It would set apart, first of all, the cognitive from the noncognitive, showing how the latter kind of experience, embodied and refined in the works of the poet and the artist, dwelling primarily in the immediate and the introspective, by its very nature defies the kind of understanding and rational organization achieved by science. Let the students reflect upon so simple a distinction as is conveyed by the words "house" and "home" to appreciate the artistic, noncognitive aspects of the latter. Then, having indicated and acknowledged the natural limits of science, outline for them the central task of science, the unique way in which it brings the rhapsody of perceptions, to use a phrase of Kant's, or William James' "buzzing, blooming confusion" into correspondence with the symphony of ideas which we call a valid theory. There is no time to outline such a course on this occasion. But I refuse to admit that it can not be taught at a prescience level, for experiments show that it can. Moreover, there is evidence that students who have been exposed to it enter the factual science courses with a far better preparation than the ordinary smattering of science

knowledge they acquire in high schools; their appetites are whetted and they do better work.

If matters are to be sacrificed to make a modernized curriculum possible, my candidates for ejection would be drawn from the large field of elementary language instruction. There is no reason why beginning modern languages should be taught laboriously in our colleges when a summer in France or Germany would do the trick, and indeed offer further benefits. The economic advantages at a time when teaching has become very expensive while travel has remained cheap clearly recommend this step.

University Structure and Methods of Teaching

Most problems of university governance currently under discussion are tactical in nature. They arise in local crises under the pressure of student militancy and call for compromises in response to threats. It is fairly clear that activism on campuses has been an anomaly amplified grotesquely out of all proportion to its causes, and that it will slowly subside. What has happened in most places by way of administrative countermeasures was palliative, conciliatory, intended to soothe immediate urgencies.

There are, on the other hand, a few strategic points of governance and of university structure which bear more permanent importance. One has to do with the influence of alumni, whose voice is very strong in institutions that depend on them for support. Their views are conservative, they are the anchor to the past. No college should be dependent on their strategic judgment. This raises serious problems for private universities, but they ought to be raised, for there are serious questions about the reasons for existence of private universities. The word *private* should probably be replaced by independent, for the sustenance of these institutions is in large measure provided by public funds. Independence, however, means independence of control by public bodies, and all too frequently dependence upon alumni judgments.

There is no danger, I believe, that a successful private university will die because it gives up alumni control. The

public, the state, the federal government would not tolerate its demise. One might even prophesy that we are already engaged in a slow process of dissolving even the residue of sense in which Harvard, Yale and Princeton, to name the oldest members of the club, are private institutions. And they are fortunately freeing themselves of alumni control. This is as it should be.

But a little more can be said on this matter of control. Governance of a college is largely in the hands of a board of trustees, respectable men and women possessing both material wealth and intellectual attainments. They are often chosen for their status in the community in the hope of enhancing public relations, sometimes for their money-raising ability, not always for their interest in education. Alumni sometimes dominate the board. As a measure of immediate necessity I would urge that a significant fraction of the board of trustees be recruited from the college faculty and that a few student members be added. It may be noted in this connection that the senate of a European university is made up entirely of professors.

The difference in structure between our American college system and that of most other countries is well known. Abroad, secondary education leads to a certificate (bacheau, abitur, etc.) which, aside from securing admission to a university, assures competence on the part of its holder to enter many desirable technical and business careers. This certificate is usually attained at the age of nineteen or twenty; it marks the end of formalized education for many and has for practical purposes the prestige of the A.B. degree.

One wonders, in view of this very old and very common alien practice whether there is sufficient justification for our insistence upon carrying what we call liberal education to the age of twenty-two, i.e., to the A.B. degree. Perhaps our economic system can afford it, although this may be doubted. A bias already exists in the painful scarcity of good plumbers, gardeners and automobile repairmen, with an overabundance of A.B.'s and perhaps Ph.D.'s. I tend to prefer the foreign system as a more reasonable approach to mass education, and I see it coming here. The vast increase in the

number of community institutions, most of them junior colleges, is a telling sign. There will be a time when businessmen, bankers and even the trade unions will perhaps be content with the kind of training given in the first two college years, when the A.B. or B.S. degree will be what it purports to be, an affidavit of admission to a specialized academic career. The break between the undergraduate and the graduate school will then be lessened, that between sophomore and junior year, however, sharpened. Four-year colleges may then shed their first two years and extend themselves upward into the postgraduate field. I urge university administrators to bear these possibilities in mind.

Tenure and academic rewards are favored subjects of discussion, especially by the younger faculty who secure them rather easily. It is difficult to find fault with our general practices in this area. Competition operates in the university marketplace as it does in other industries. I know of no professor who remains underpaid for long if he is successful. Many are overpaid inasmuch as they can, if they are without scruples, augment their income almost indefinitely by consulting and outside lecturing. Perhaps these external activities do need to be more carefully controlled.

The stick and carrot principle is also usefully employed. The pretension of the academic rulers is that they will tolerate only professors who are both good teachers and successful researchers or scholars. Reality, however, falls short of this pretension. Hence administrators have evolved an ingenious compromise, which exists in an alternating emphasis upon teaching and research. At one time it is proclaimed that only good teachers are promoted, at another that research is the major premise for advancement. At Yale, the period of alternation has been about eight years, approximately equal to, but not in phase with the cycle from a numerical to a letter system of marking. These may be things of the past; but as a device of expediency I recommend the policy of wavering.

A word remains to be said about the method of teaching, about ways of soliciting student participation. I do believe that lectures should be de-emphasized in favor of informal

teaching, that seminars, workshops and laboratories ought to be the dominant forms of instruction. Not only do they possess pedagogical advantages—and this should be decisive even in spite of their greater cost—they are also the kinds of instruction most teachers are best able to perform. However, lectures should by no means be abolished. They can be high-rate performances, admirable and impressive not only because of the message they convey in concentrated fashion, but because of elegance of presentation and orderliness of structure. Unfortunately, few people lecture well. These gifted individuals ought to be singled out for the task to which they are suited, and they will do their best for the largest audience. When it is decided that a person and a subject are appropriate for a lecture, the silly rule which restricts the audience to fifty or a hundred students is to be rejected. With available amplifier and television techniques, only the auditorium capacity should set the limit. My most memorable learning experience was a carefully organized speech by an eminent philosopher who, because of an overflow audience, had to lecture in a cathedral. I should not trade this experience for a hundred cozy tutoring sessions.

IV.

The Regional University and Comprehensive College: Some Ideas

Richard E. Peterson*

It has become commonplace to assert that there is a crisis in American higher education. To be sure, a handful of universities, especially in the spring and in California, seem always to be facing the prospect of imminent shutdown due to actions of militant students; and at any given time some number of smaller private colleges are debating whether they have the financial wherewithal to reopen the next fall. But the great hulking mass of the nation's higher education continues to lumber along, unsteadily—like some great wounded beast surrounded by hounds nipping at its exposed flanks. Thus the great brute lives. It even expands in some places. But its essential form and functions have not really changed very much in some time; the university seems incapable of evolving new forms with survival value for the times, new structures which, like wings, might help it to escape the jaws of student activists, liberated women, uptight taxpayers, opportunistic politicians, and various other predatory creatures.

* Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service.

If not a crisis, certainly serious illness. For faculty and administrators the sickness is one of uncertainty, distrust, and demoralization. Among many students it is a discontent founded on a sense that the university is irrelevant and unresponsive, that it denies their freedom and humanity, and that the university, when it should be pursuing teaching and learning, is serving a host of other interests, including some of the most evil political and corporate forces abroad in the land. Brought on largely by a morally sensitized—indeed, self-righteous—younger generation of students and faculty that takes little for granted and actively rejects much that is traditional and conventional, the fabric of authority at many colleges and universities is coming apart at a frightening pace. Few people have confidence in anyone else's conception of what is correct or needs to be done. Respect, trust, and a sense of community have given way to self-interested factionalism. Increasingly all manner of constituent groups are digging in to protect their own interests and to stake out a share of the emerging power distribution.[1] Increasingly there is little sense of institutional mission around which all elements of the institution—students, faculty, administrators, regents, taxpayers—can make common cause. The University, in short, is seriously ill.

In talking about regional universities and comprehensive colleges, I will be talking mainly about structure, but also about purpose. I quite realize, that new structural or organizational arrangements will not be the panacea, the miracle drug; the most carefully conceived structures can readily be subverted by strong individuals and self-serving groups. At the same time I'm just as convinced that only by creating essentially new institutions can higher education break out of its rut, shake loose of the hounds, if you will. To expect an existing institution to really reform itself is usually asking the impossible; vested interests have grown too strong, and too

[1] In a single recent issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 13, 1970) there were reports of four groups having asserted and codified their rights (student personnel administrators, untenured faculty, nonvoting regents, and women).

unwilling to change.[2] Since the period of expansion in higher education—the numbers game— is soon to be over, we are not talking here about physically new campuses in addition to existing ones; we're talking instead about radically reconstructing present systems, about rearranging things in hopes of breaking up entrenched power blocks and giving the ailing beast a new vitality and sense of purpose.

As the title for this talk indicates, my purpose is merely to set forth some ideas, and not to lay down anything resembling a complete, finished plan. Needless to say, the choice of topics touched on reflects my experience in educational and social research, as well as my association with a testing agency. Somebody else with a different background would certainly dwell on different aspects of the general topic.

The RUCC[3] Model: General Outline and Basic Premises

The proposed regional university would consist of some number of four-year comprehensive colleges spread around the region, a smaller number of separate graduate centers, and a regional university chancellor's office. (States with several metropolitan regions would also have a statewide university president and supporting office.) All public higher education in a given metropolitan region would be embraced in the single unified regional university system. Thus there might be the Regional University of Detroit, or the Regional University of Los Angeles.[4]

Organization by Region. Why do it this way? A given metropolitan region, New York City and northeast New Jersey, or the San Francisco Bay Area, for example, may be viewed as a unique configuration of economic, cultural, poli-

[2] The problem is mainly with the faculty. Some relevant evidence has recently been adduced by a Carnegie (Kerr) Commission sponsored national survey of faculty (see *The Chronicle*, April 6, 1970). Also several recent studies by T. R. McConnell have analyzed the impact of faculty oligarchies on campus governance (see *The Research Reporter*, Vol. V, No. 1, 1970, from the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education).

[3] Standing for Regional University and Comprehensive Colleges.

[4] Extending perhaps from Ventura to San Bernadino to Laguna Beach.

tical, ethnic, and related factors. And each such region would also have a unique pattern of higher education needs. Equally important, a given metropolitan region is in a sense tied together and comprehendable by its citizens through various transportation links and the mass media. By means of the press, radio, and TV people throughout the region may be kept informed of events taking place in all parts of the region, and, by using freeways, subways, etc., participation in these activities becomes possible for everyone in the region.

For all these reasons, the metropolitan region seems the most logical geographical basis for operating what would be a *coordinated* system designed to give coherence to *all* the public higher education resources of the region toward meeting the higher education needs of *all* the adults in the region.[5]

A Single Unified System. Why a single system, rather than something else? The widely copied California model, for example, has three segments, sometimes called tiers—the University of California, the four-year State Colleges, and the two-year Junior Colleges. Each segment has its own independent statewide governing board.[6] There *is* a statewide Coordinating Council for Higher Education, but it has advisory functions only.

The California system has been criticized for some years for the lack of overall planning and coordination that characterizes it. Indeed, it has been mainly the *tier* concept that other states have taken over, particularly the junior college idea. Along with the lack of coordination in California, there has come the inevitable competition among the three segments for the available money and other resources—certainly a familiar theme to older higher education hands in many states. The late Arthur Coons, the chairman of the team that wrote the California Master Plan, asserted in 1968:

---

[5] A scheme for reorganizing higher education in California into regions is presented in *The Challenge of Achievement;* A Report on Public and Private Higher Education in California to the Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature (Jesse Unruh, Chairman), January 1969.

[6] Each junior college, in addition, has its local, lay board of trustees.

> Within each segment there has been some struggle between and among institutions, but the main struggles have been between and among the segments themselves as major 'corporate' estates vying for advantage, favor, and finance. At times these segments have sought or have found common ground. At other times, and much more characteristically, they have been vying vigorously for their own interests, often with not much evidence to support the idea of a commonly respected profession, manifesting bitter animosity, charges, and counter claims.[7]

Other investigations have pointed to the inadequate planning duplication of facilities, waste of resources, absence of "cost of alternative" studies, and various attempts to circumvent the Master Plan's delineation of functions.[8]

A situation like this ought not to be tolerated in any state or locality. Inflation-ridden taxpaying publics, no longer in a mood to take higher education for granted, are not going to stand for it. All this notwithstanding, a single unified system should go a long way to bring about economies and to make possible the kind of creative planning necessary to meet the changing educational needs of the entire region.

A unified system would have other advantages as well. Articulation among the various institutions in the region would be improved. Students should be able to move readily from one college to another, conceivably even taking courses at different colleges during the same term. Faculty could move around; salaries and fringe benefits would be standardized; all sorts of innovative staffing arrangements would be possible. Libraries, laboratories and other facilities could be shared. Admissions procedures would be standardized. And so on.

Separate Undergraduate and Graduate Education/ Research. Why conduct undergraduate education, on the one hand, and graduate education and research on the other in physicaliy separate facilities—in four-year colleges and graduate centers, respectively? The main reason is that professors who are oriented toward research and publishing and training

---

[7] Arthur G. Coons, *Crisis in California Higher Education.* Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1968. Page 210.

[8] See, for example, the *Governor's Survey on Efficiency and Cost Control,* Sacramento, 1968.

their "own" graduate students are by and large not much interested in helping undergraduates to learn.

The myth that active engagement in research is essential to good teaching seems to me to be just that—a myth. I know of no evidence to support it. Ralph Tyler says in a recent article that, after 47 years in academic life, he has come upon no "valid evidence" to support what he terms the "folklore that every teacher should also be a researcher," and goes on to explain:

> The teacher's tasks are sufficiently different from the tasks of the research scholar that it is difficult to carry on both at the same time. It is even uncommon to find one person who is deeply interested in doing both kinds of tasks. Hence, the prevailing expectation that every professor should be both, a good teacher and a good research scholar, largely results in ineffectiveness in both roles. As a result, most students are poorly guided in their learning efforts, and relatively few faculty members contribute significantly to the development of knowledge.[9]

It's on these grounds that I would make the case for clearly separating undergraduate teaching from research and graduate training, both of which are important functions for a modern university. Because both are important, why dilute either one by asking the same professor to do both?[10] They won't do both, of course, and in practice the job of teaching undergraduates gets turned over to graduate assistants who are barely five years older than their students. Thus in California you have the situation where the "best" students in the state are enrolled at the University (rather than the State Colleges or Junior Colleges) to be exposed to probably the worst teaching, at the highest cost to the taxpayer.[11]

One Type of Institution for Undergraduate Instruction. Why have just a single type of public college in which all undergraduate instruction in the region is carried on? In

---

[9] Ralph W. Tyler, *The Changing Structure of American Institutions of Higher Education in the United States.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

[10] For able professors wanting to do both, there would be ample opportunities in the private universities.

[11] See *Achievement in Higher Education,* op. cit., p. 51, for comparative data on the costs of instruction in the three segments.

California and a few other states this would mean converting all the existing junior colleges into four-year colleges (and moving all the undergrads out of the nine University campuses). And what of the idea of diversity or pluralism which so many people regard as the genius of American higher education?

Basically there are only three types of public higher education institutions in the U.S.: multipurpose universities, four-year colleges, and two-year junior colleges. Under the RUCC plan, the three would be reduced to two—the comprehensive colleges and the graduate centers. And there would still be all the private colleges in the region, which is where most of the diversity that people speak about exists anyway. Finally, the comprehensive colleges, despite structural similarities, would, as I would envision them, be markedly different in their culture, style, and ethos.

All this said, however, the case for a single kind of college is made chiefly on the basis of social and moral values. The fundamental social-moral principle is that of equity; meaning equality of educational opportunity; meaning in practice that a person living in one part of the metropolitan region should have access to the same general range of educational opportunities as a person living in any other part of the region. Consider someone who hasn't the money or time to travel across town to get the courses he needs; let's say, for example that if he can't attend college near where he works, he can't get the education he wants at all. Or, in multi-level systems, many people would have no choice but to go to the local junior college, when their needs would be better met by the four-year college ten miles but forty minutes down the freeway. Under the RUCC Plan, the same general, *and broad*, range of opportunities would be available everywhere in the area.

The equity principle can be understood in yet another way. The presence of a college in a community has a generally positive impact on the culture of that community. Citizens are exposed to ideas and values that they would not be otherwise. Two-year colleges and four-year institutions obviously differ in the aggregate of intellectual resources that

each embraces; the latter, compared to the former, would have a more potent impact on the community. So the rhetorical question: is it right for one community, or part of a metropolitan region, to have a four-year college in its midst, and another part of the city, a two-year college?

There are other arguments for the single comprehensive college model. In the short run, it would help meet the concerns of minority student activists who can plainly see that in multi-level systems their people end up in the lowest level (in the junior colleges), that such a system seems to operate as a caste system. Needless to say, there is an egalitarian mood rampant in the country of the young that we older people ignore at our peril. Can we overlook the potential, in the longer run, that a tiered educational system has for perpetuating the stratified society we have now, or of creating a society even more stratified than the present one? Amitai Etzioni, a sociologist at Columbia University, has noted recently that a multi-level higher education approach

> . . . institutionalizes and maximizes the visibility of differences (among educational programs), and leads to the concentration of students of disadvantaged background in some colleges. If separation of students by preparation and aptitude is necessary, it may be better to do so within each institution rather than to allow a system to emerge in which the name of the college you graduate from provides a basis for a rigidly stratified system which overshadows individual differences and achievements.[12]

The network of *private* colleges and universities contribute powerfully to maintaining a stratified society; graduates of Ivy League universities, for example, have relatively easy entry to positions of prestige and power. I think that it can at least be argued, on political and moral grounds, that *public* higher education, as an instrument of public policy, should operate to minimize the stereotyping of graduates of particular kinds of colleges, especially since for so many people the decision to attend a particular college depends on fortui-

---

[12] Amitai Etzioni, *Post-Secondary Education and the Disadvantaged: A Policy Study*, New York City: Center for Policy Research, November 1969, Page 34.

tious circumstances such as where the person happens to be living or how much money he has at the time.

The Comprehensive College

Purpose and Scope. The comprehensive college is so designated chiefly because it offers a very broad range of educational programs, and because admission to it is essentially open. Its main purpose is to help individuals of all ages reach whatever educational goals they have set for themselves. Secondary purposes would include service to the local community, action research in the community, and research on the learning process.

The curriculum would encompass the most rigorous courses in the arts and sciences for students seeking advanced degrees, various two- and one-year technical programs, as well as special remedial and literacy training programs. Two-year degrees, the bachelor's, and, in a limited number of fields, the master's degree could be earned. A very large proportion of the student body, however, would not be seeking degrees, and perhaps a majority would be enrolled part-time rather than full-time. Classes would be scheduled from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., and the college would operate the year around.

The optimum size for a comprehensive college would be in the neighborhood of about 12,000 full-time equivalent students; many fewer than that would mean curtailment of the range of offerings because of insufficient student damand.

Community or Neighborhood Focus. The comprehensive colleges would be community-oriented in several ways.

(1) They would be essentially commuter colleges. Perhaps a majority of the students would live at home. Others would live in private rooms or apartments. None of the colleges would be in the dormitory or housing business. Since a core curriculum would be offered at all the colleges, most students would take most of their courses at the campus nearest their place of residence, although attendance there would not be required. There might be substantial moving around between the sophomore and junior years when some students, narrow-

ing their field of studies, may move nearer the college offering the desired courses.

(2) Each college would also be "neighborhood" or "community" in the sense that each would have unique programs designed to meet the educational needs of the people in the respective communities. These special programs would help make for the distinctive cultures and styles that I spoke of earlier. Again using the Los Angeles area as an illustration, the college in San Fernando might have an extensive theatre arts program; Long Beach College would be strong in marine biology; Ontario College in agriculture; Pasadena College in aerospace engineering; Laguna Beach College in the graphic arts; Mid-City College in urban sociology; and so forth. Course work would be widely integrated with the resources of the community; all sorts of cooperative arrangements would enable workshops and seminars off campus, work-study experiences, internship in community agencies, course related part-time work for pay, and the like.

(3) Third, the college would be expected to engage in a variety of service activities at the request of local interests. The problem would be where to draw the line. Perhaps every such service activity should allow participation of some number of students; the service, in short, should also constitute a learning experience for students. But what if the request comes from the local Dow Chemical plant, or John Birch chapter, or the Welfare Mothers Alliance, or the Grape Pickers Union?

(4) Finally, the college would serve as a cultural and educational center for the community. Lectures and concerts would be open to the public. College facilities would be available to local groups for meetings, workshops, etc.

Admissions, Testing, Counseling. Admission would be open—which might mean, as in the California junior colleges, open to any high school graduate or person over age 18. However, the vast majority of entering students cannot be turned loose to operate willy-nilly within the curriculum. In fact, what I'm about to suggest will seem quite the opposite, and my connections with a testing agency all too obvious.

Early in the summer after graduating from high school, all,

or almost all students planning to enroll for credit at the college would take a very extensive battery of tests—aptitude tests, achievement tests in various subjects, tests of various intellectual processes, interest inventories, and so on.[13] The purpose of the tests, of course, is not to determine whether or not the person is to be admitted. Instead, the testing, which would yield a detailed profile of academic strengths and weaknesses, is to help determine placement in the curriculum. Placement in two ways: (1) kinds of courses and levels of difficulty, and (2) the kinds of instructional methods most suited to the student (such as independent study, small seminars, large lectures, etc.).

All the test information would be fed into a computer, which when asked would spew out an array of advice for the student: courses that are strongly recommended—perhaps even essential in the computer's opinion; categories of courses not open to the student; most suitable modes of instruction; possible courses and programs at other colleges, and so forth. The idea, in short, is that the test profile for a given prospective student is matched by the computer against the total range of educational offerings available to entering students in the regional university system, to come up with the best possible program of study. In a counseling interview—every professor and administrator is also a counselor—the computer's judgments are explained to the student, other information such as high school grades, career aspirations, and various other aspects of the student's life-situation are considered, and a study-plan gets finalized. If a candidate doesn't want to buy the computer's judgments, American society hopefully would have some alternatives for him. If the computer, for example, should indicate that remedial reading, writing, and arithmetic have to be included in his first term study-plan, the individual could opt for full-time

[13] The tests would be optional. The day is past when people can be coerced into taking tests—giving information about themselves. Students with excellent high school records would be given the option explicitly. All others would be advised as forcefully as possible to take the tests. Those choosing not to might be admitted on probation with the stipulation that if their performance the first term falls below some standard they must take the tests, or be dismissed.

work, Nixon's all-volunteer army, a hippy commune, or something else.

I've talked at some length about this rather elaborate and unfortunately mechanistic placement process because something like it, I'm convinced, is in the interests of all concerned. Certainly without such a mechanism the kind of open-ended college proposed here would be totally unworkable.

Curriculum. The curriculum would be extremely diverse in both content and method—lectures on medieval history, downtown seminars on urban planning, independent chemistry research, workshops on educational practice involving practicing educators, remedial math and spelling involving a single student and a computer. The basic outlines of each college's curriculum would be determined by research on the educational needs of the region and community and the characteristics of the entering students (using data from the placement tests). Sequences of courses ("course" broadly defined) leading to degrees and various certificates would be delineated. Some sequences would be established to prepare advanced students for existing and new programs at the graduate centers; i.e., there would be some concern for specialized articulation between the undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Within these very general guidelines, however, individual teachers and students would have very great freedom to devise all manner of learning experiences.[14] The comprehensive colleges would be organized into some seven academic divisions or schools—life sciences, physical sciences and engineering, social sciences, humanities, the arts, education, and business—and it would be at this level that additions to the curriculum would be approved. (More on the proposed role of the divisions at a later point.)

Each college would also have a Skills Center, which in its scope of activities and importance to the overall work of the

[14] Courses judged worthy of offering in subsequent terms would have to have sufficient structure for the course to be definable for purposes of the college catalog and the computer placement mechanism.

college would be the equal of any of the academic divisions. The Skills Center would be staffed by highly trained experts in teaching adults to read, write, compute, and solve problems.[15] They would be paid the same as the academic people. All the most advanced equipment and methods would be employed. The staff of the Skills Center would also be expected to carry out applied research on adult learning, with special emphasis on techniques for literacy training.

New approaches to grading and judging student performance would be tried out and used in the comprehensive colleges. In view of the close coordination and ease of communications between faculties of the colleges and graduate center, pass-fail or no-grade systems should not be a hindrance to students moving from the former to the latter.

What about degrees? First, of course, they must mean something; and in the proposed regional system, the same degree should mean roughly the same thing at all the colleges. The best way to accomplish this, it seems to me, is by means of comprehensive senior exams (senior comps). Perhaps the way to proceed is for staff and student representatives in a given discipline from each of the colleges to jointly define the domain of knowledge, mastery of which would be requisite for the degree. The resulting general specifications for the degree examination would be turned over to an external agency which would construct the actual test. Professors and students would return to their respective colleges to develop the most effective set of learning experiences they can conceive for instilling mastery of the subject domain as they have defined it. (The profs would never see the test itself.) This whole process of degree definition might be repeated every five years or so. In addition to the major field portion of the senior comps, there would also be a standard basic literacy test, and perhaps also short general tests in the sciences and humanities.

The Faculty. Probably the most critical element in any

[15] Or, conceivably a college could contract out operation of its Skills Center to a private organization that would be reimbursed according to how many people it raises to some level of literacy.

education institution is the faculty. The comprehensive college is a place where a great variety of people have come to learn. The faculty must first and foremost be teachers. Make no mistake. Demonstrated ability to communicate about a field of knowledge, first, and acceptance of the open, non-elitist ethos of the comprehensive college, second, would be the principal considerations in recruiting faculty. Possession of the Ph.D. and number of publications would be strictly secondary, although not unimportant; faculty obviously must be informed if their students are to learn.

With regard to faculty pay and promotion, teaching effectiveness should account for something on the order of 40 per cent of the reward "pie;" 20 per cent might depend on effectiveness, especially originality, of contribution to the general work of the professor's division and college; 20 per cent for effectiveness of service work in the surrounding community; and 20 per cent for research, writing, and achievement in professional organizations.

How is teaching effectiveness to be assessed? Primarily, I would say, by the reactions of students. There would be end-of-term course and teacher evaluations for every course or other type of learning experience. Records would be kept of the numbers of students signing up for and transfering out of every course. I see no alternative to substantial reliance on this kind of evaluation, given the purposes of the institution. A professor may be absolutely brilliant, but if students can't dig him, I don't see how his employment can be justified. Yet, it should be said, that different kinds of students value different kinds of teachers. Both the student body and the curriculum would be extremely heterogeneous. With careful recruiting at the outset, almost every professor should soon enough be able to find himself in a satisfactory teaching situation.

Yet, on the other hand again, no one at the comprehensive college would have tenure, life-time tenure. The tax-paying public, the students, their parents who are helping pay the tuition and provide room and board—nobody can tolerate incompetence (defined in terms of the reward pie, mentioned above). Incompetency, no; academic freedom, yes. Protec-

tion of the academic freedom of faculty and students would have to be the concern of everyone, most especially of the institutional leaders.

Some will say that the kind of faculty routine I've outlined so far looks rather bleak, uninviting to the active mind, like we would be creating a class of academic drones. Perhaps. At least two sorts of arrangements seem possible. First there would be a liberal sabbatical policy by which a man could take off and do pretty much what he wants. Second, in the proposed regional university set-up, there could be an arrangement by which instructors at the colleges could periodically, say every fourth year, spend a year at one of the graduate centers at full pay doing things related to his teaching—reading, attending seminars, working on a doctorate, writing something for publication, doing a piece of research independently or in collaboration with someone else in the university system, exchanging ideas with other teachers about instructional practice. An arrangement like this would make for frequent personal renewal and intellectual expansion, while maintaining the focus on teaching during the intervening years. This latter seems essential; the faculty at the comprehensive colleges must be *full-time* teachers, available at all times to students. Faculty research during these years would be largely limited to studies (evaluations) of learning experiences and action research in the community; all such research would involve extensive student participation.

It goes without saying that faculty salary scales, the same at the colleges as at the graduate centers, would be among the highest in the academic world.

The Graduate Centers

The basic purposes that give direction to the graduate centers would be (1) to advance knowledge through research and scholarship; (2) to prepare people to do research, teach in college, and assume various other professional roles such as in law and medicine; and (3) to serve as an instrument of public policy. This last purpose would mean that the graduate centers would help implement federal (and/or state)

programs that entail research or training of professionals; examples might include measures for expanded health care, pollution control, urban renewal, water resources development, etc.[16]

In contrast to the colleges, the graduate centers would be heavily funded from federal sources, and many of the students would come from outside the region or state. Qualities like scientific knowledgeability, research originality, scholarly brilliance, and professional skill and achievement are the bases for recruiting and rewarding faculty. Research productivity will become measurable; incompetency, meaning perhaps an absence of ideas, will not be tolerated; nor will the public tolerate hiring stars, to do little work at $35,000 per, in order to enhance departmental prestige.

In a reorganization, the existing universities with large graduate enrollments in a region would become the graduate centers. Rather than general purpose or comprehensive in scope, the several graduate centers, if there are more than one in the region, would build on existing strengths. Thus, using Los Angeles again as the example, the Graduate Center of Los Angeles (formerly UCLA) would have a truly great medical school; the Center at Irvine, a distinguished school of public affairs; Riverside, a center of excellence in the humanities; Santa Barbara, a strong educational research program. Decisions to establish new departments, institutes, or schools, e.g., a new law school, would be made in the statewide university president's office (or in the regional university chancellor's office if there is only one regional university system in the state; Washington State, for example). As mentioned earlier, the pattern of federal support would also affect decisions to create new programs in the graduate centers.

Residential facilities would be provided for all who need them. Much of the existing dormitory space built to house undergraduates at what were previously general purpose uni-

[16] Since the Regional University will have determined that secret research contradicts academic values, there would be no defense or weapons research. For the same reason, there would be no ROTC at the comprehensive colleges.

versities, however, would no longer be needed for living in and could be converted into office space for department men, graduate students, and secretaries; or the dorms could be sold to private firms for rental to the hundreds of people attracted to the graduate centers to clean test tubes, punch IBM cards, care for white rats, and so forth.[17]

The Regional University Chancellor's Office

The staff of the Chancellor's Office would carry out most of the usual university administrative and management functions: budget preparation, centralized purchasing, legal services, public relations, liaison with governmental agencies and foundations regarding contracts and grants, and so forth. Also envisioned are several perhaps less familiar kinds of administrative activities.

There would be a large Regional University planning group comprised of a permanent staff and a rotating staff of faculty and students from the component institutions representing an assortment of academic disciplines (such as economics, architecture, urban planning, philosophy).

There would be a large regional research group, with both permanent and rotating staffs, that would routinely gather information about the region of relevance to the work of the university system—for example, data on the educational plans of high school students, manpower needs of local industries, activities of governmental agencies, population movement in the region, educational and cultural interests of older people, and the like.

There would be a large institutional research group (with permanent and rotating staffs) that would routinely conduct analyses of the effectiveness of the total university system and its various components.[18] For example, performance on

[17] The football stadium could be easily sold to municipal authorities or private promoters. Most of the remaining athletic facilities would be used on a reduced basis by resident academics for keeping in good physical condition (or as an outlet for hostilities, the strains of graduate student life being what they are). Facilities could also be made available for secondary schools for staging major sports events.

[18] It seems to me absolutely essential that meaningful ways be

the senior comps at the various colleges could be looked at.[19] Various other cost-benefit, program simulation, operations analysis, and management information activities would be handled by this group.

There would be a testing office that would construct and score the freshman and senior exams, as well as help individual instructors with tests for their courses.

The Regional University registrar, a centralized record keeper, would make use of the most advanced computing and data processing equipment for managing the truly incredible amount of information accumulated by the system. Every conceivable kind of recordkeeping would be automated. Methods for immediate access to the computer's memory would be needed, so that, for example, a counselor could readily obtain a student's record to help him make some decision about his studies.

Finally, there would be a mediation service that would be available upon request to individuals and groups in the component institutions to help them resolve real conflicts of real interests.

Governance

In the spirit of the times, I shall assert that the concepts of decentralization, participation, responsiveness, even community, are valid principles of governance for colleges and universities. Nonsense, many will say; difficult at best in a college of 2,000, unthinkable in a college of 12,000. I say we don't have much choice. The times are fast changing. The new generation with a new set of values is fast upon us. The truly great challenge to the university in the 1970's, it seems to me, will be to create environments that realize the ideals of participation and community. Institutions that cannot,

---

developed for interpreting the work of the university to the public and for rendering account of what is being accomplished with the taxpayer's dollar.

[19] *Absolute* scores on the senior comps would be less important than the *differences* between entering freshmen and senior test scores, which would tell something about how much learning has taken place.

face either being boycotted by young people or being rendered inoperative as intellectual enterprises by deep and continuing internal conflict.

Decentralization would seem to be the structural key. This means dispersing authority down and out from where it usually resides now on most campuses. It means arranging things so that decisions can get made as far down in the system as possible. Decentralization, to work, requires not just new structural arrangements but a new spirit. To make it work, a new breed of administrators may be needed—patient, trusting, open, not uncomfortable in fluid situations—truly princes among men.

A college decentralized both in fact and in spirit would be responsive—students, faculty, others, could expect to get green lights quickly, without waiting for an idea to work its way up and down some chain of command.[20]

I mentioned earlier organizing the comprehensive college into some seven schools or divisions—life sciences, humanities, business, and so on. With every student a member of one of these divisions from the time he enters the college, these would be large groupings—numbering 1,000 to 3,000 students. Nonetheless, might it be possible to develop an urban college counterpart of the Santa Cruz cluster college model? The Santa Cruz campus of the University of California, as you know, is comprised of residential units with students in

---

[20] Martin Trow has noted that decentralization may also have advantages in terms of political realities external to the university: "One way to reduce the impact of mass publics on the university is to decrease the size of authoritative (i.e., autonomous) units within it. A university cannot experiment, which implies the certainty of making errors and the near certainty of offending somebody, if it has to satisfy the lowest common denominator of popular sentiment on every issue. What brings many issues to public attention is that they are decided, or at least approved, at a very high level, and thus are seen to have widespread consequences . . . it seems inescapable that the university will in the future be involved much more frequently in highly controversial issues and actions for which mass support cannot always be gained. Such activities may have a better chance of not becoming the focus for a major crisis . . . if decisions are not taken at the state-wide level in ways that require politicians and other politically ambitious people to take public stands." Martin Trow, "Elite and Popular Functions in Higher Education." In W. R. Niblet (Ed.) *Higher Education: Demand and Response*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1970. Pp. 192-193.

each sharing a common general intellectual interest—the humanities, or public affairs, for example. Could the academic division in the proposed comprehensive college be made a kind of intellectual *and* social and emotional home base for the student, something with which he could identify and feel involved?

I have made no mention of the academic department, which many observers (including this one) hold to be among the most notably dysfunctional elements in the American university. In a regional reorganization, division deans with the help of newly recruited faculty and a cadre of prospective students would have the opportunity early on to develop working plans for whatever academic arrangements seem necessary within the division. Personalities and styles of the people in such a task group would do much to set the tone for the division. Once the new college begins operation, these arrangements could be modified and approved (and periodically modified thereafter) by the Division Council, discussed below. Divisional substructures and operating procedures need not be uniform from college to college, nor from division to division within a college. Such arrangements would depend in part on the size and scope of the division. Possible other bases for organizing the work of the division could include: interdisciplinary problem areas, lower- vs. upper-division work, on- vs. off-campus work, theoretical vs. practical work, degree or certificate (credit) vs. non-degree work, or some combination of such factors. In short, the proposed comprehensive college might have departments in the conventional sense, but most likely not.

Formal Governance Structure. Let me hurry through what the formal structure of governance might look like at the comprehensive college. As I see it, the academic division would be the most important level at which students and faculty would participate.[21] There would be a Division

[21] To be sure, at most colleges today most students and most faculty are not interested in participating in campus governance on any kind of continuing basis. Yet, I would argue, that the opportunity must be there for those who do, and for others who only sporadically want to get involved, depending, say, on the nature of the issues or problems that crop up.

Council. It might have eight student and eight faculty members. The students could be a man and a woman from each of the four classes—freshman, sophomore, etc.—elected in some kind of town meeting. To these 16 add three administrators, three representatives from the off-campus community appointed by the division dean, and three representatives from the secretaries, cafeteria workers, custodians, etc., which would bring the number of Council members to 25.

The Division Council would serve as a forum for communication, for keeping people informed about what's happening in the division, college, and university; and it would be the basic mechanism for solving problems, problems broadly defined, that affect the division as a whole. Typically, the dean would bring a problem, a plan, or other matter to the Council; the Council would appoint a task group, hold open hearings, and eventually vote some kind of decision. The dean of the division would function something like the president of the United States: he exercises leadership by presenting proposals to the Council; he also has the power of veto, since he is accountable to the college president for everything that goes on in his division.

To continue, there would also be an All-College Assembly that is constituted and functions in about the same way as the division councils. Fourteen of its members might be students and faculty elected from the seven division councils; the seven deans would be members; and there would be representatives from the other constituencies, including the Skills Center.

And there would be a regional university governing board, following the same model. Finally, in the big and populous states, there would be a statewide university president with an office (in the state capital) comprised mainly of planning specialists, particularly financial planners. The president's task is to put the plans submitted by the regional university chancellors into a single state public higher education plan, and then sell it to the state legislature.[22]

---

[22] I don't see the need for a lay board of regents or trustees at this level (or at any level).

The Academic Union. One final idea. Going back to the themes of responsiveness and community, I suggested trying to make the academic divisions in a comprehensive college work like the Santa Cruz cluster colleges, the thought being that the division of which a student is a member could serve as a means for integrating both the intellectual and the social or interpersonal spheres of his college life.

I'd like to submit the concept of an academic union as a social and physical structure which brings people, mainly students and faculty, together (unifies them?) around shared interest in a domain of knowledge. Each of the seven divisions in the comprehensive college would have its own union building. The Social Sciences Union (building), for example, would house at least the following:

1. The division dean's office;
2. Various information givers (financial aids, jobs, new courses, etc.);
3. A division ombudsman, for people who can't get any satisfaction from anyone;
4. A division library (like a branch library);
5. An anthropology museum (an art gallery in the Arts College Union, a natural history museum in the Life Sciences Union);
6. Study carrels and locker facilities, both essential for commuting students;
7. Rooms of all sizes for every conceivable kind of meeting, including open meetings of the Division Council;
8. A room large enough for invited lectures, films, dances, and rock concerts;
9. A cafeteria and snack bar;
10. Pleasant space for just sitting around rapping or doing nothing at all.

Therewith an idea for helping build academic communities on a large campus that seeks to provide learning experiences for everyone who wants them.

Conclusion

To say that we live in a time of change, and that the university must be relevant to the times, is to make understatements that insult the sensibilities of intelligent people. I would only say that American higher education desperately needs an informed national debate, in which the debaters, instead of championing their pet models—junior colleges, liberal arts colleges, statewide coordinating board, or whatever—address themselves to inventing new institutional forms designed to make formal higher education meaningful to all adults in what we may hope will be a learning oriented society.

It will not be easy to get such a debate going very soon. Too many people are of necessity caught up in maintaining a semblance of order on their campuses, or in keeping their institutions alive financially.

However, I would end by saying that unless people in the academic world set about themselves designing new systems, interests and forces external to the university will dictate a new order which in the long run is likely to be to the detriment of everyone concerned.

V.

The Individual in the Organized University

T. R. McConnell*

Etzioni has defined an organization as a social unit "... deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals."[1] He has said that organizations are characterized by divisions of labor, power, and communication consciously planned to attain these goals; as well as one or more centers of power or authority which control the efforts of the organization and direct them towards its purposes.

To mobilize the personal and material resources of an organization toward the attainment of its purposes, some kind of structure, more or less complex depending on the size and nature of the organization, must be devised. Planning an appropriate structure is especially difficult in a university for many reasons. One reason is that, whereas in the case of many corporations the purposes are relatively clear-cut, in a university they are much more obscure, difficult to define in specific terms, and especially hard to measure. Because the university's goals are unclear, it is difficult to design a structure instrumental to their attainment.

---

* Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. University of California, Berkeley.

[1] Etzioni, Amitai, *Modern Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1964, p.3.

Another reason for difficulty in devising a purposive administrative structure is that the university's staff is composed of professionals who have a different attitude toward authority from that which characterizes the typical corporation, although the latter is departing more and more from the classical pyramidal or hierarchical structure. In this paper I shall have more to say about structural arrangements than about problems of authority, although I recognize that it is artificial to separate the two.

Note that Etzioni said that organizations should be deliberately constructed and *reconstructed* to seek specific goals. Reconstruction is inordinately difficult. Long before most organizational arrangements are changed, they have become dysfunctional, so much so that they may serve to impede rather than to facilitate the attainment of an institution's purposes. When the purposes of an organization change, when its goals are conceived in new ways, or when the relative emphasis on its purposes and functions shifts, the organizational structure usually needs to be altered correspondingly. But this structure is subject to enormous inertia. Many persons are likely to have a vested interest in its perpetuation and make every effort to keep it essentially unchanged. Many administrative relationships are equally outmoded and need to be supplanted by newer conceptions, styles, and procedures. "The line-staff is obsolete," said Bass,[2] but nevertheless this conception of personnel relationships still dominates not only corporate management, but also university organization and administration.

If the first point to be made about organizational structure is that it is only instrumental, the second thing to be said is that it is expendable. But getting rid of it is easier said than done.

The typical organization, said Bass, developed "not in any logical sequence but accommodates to relatively transient and historical needs."[3] Thus, in a manufacturing enterprise the organization may be relevant to the kinds of products pre-

[2] Bass, B.M., *Organizational Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965, p. 270.

[3] *Ibid.*

viously rather than currently produced, or the particular characteristics of personnel which may or may not be presently employed. In visiting colleges and universities I have often found curious organizational distortions. Many of these illogical structural and administrative arrangements are not understandable until one finds out whom they were designed to circumvent, or to whose personal interests or idiosyncracies they were accommodated. Other organizational bubbles may be personal empires of faculty members or administrative officers.

When I was Dean of the College of Science, Literature and the Arts at the University of Minnesota, a new President asked me for an explanation of an organizational change which I had recommended. "At my first board meeting," he said, "one item on the agenda was the creation of a new Department of Comparative Linguistics. I would like to ask if it is your policy to proliferate the departments of your College." I replied, "No, that is really not my policy. The reason for establishing this new department was to make a place for a man who could not get along with his colleagues in the German department." I am afraid that this is about as logical as many reasons for creating bits and pieces of a university.

We should now be more concrete about the relevance of structures and functions. Consider, first, the goal of enabling the student to acquire a coherent general or liberal education—now a somewhat old-fashioned educational ideal, but one that is likely to be revived by the year 2000. What are some of the characteristics of the liberally educated person?

Certainly he should have a continuing interest in ideas. He should not be narrow in his intellectual interests, but neither need he be—nor in fact could he be—a renaissance man. It is no longer feasible to expect a student to survey all fields of human knowledge. It is reasonable to expect him to use a wide-angled rather than a restrictive lens in exploring the world of ideas, of men, and of natural phenomena.

The liberally educated man is one who has developed and disciplined his intellectual processes. He will have accomplished this in part by using methods of thought and investi-

gation employed in major fields of knowledge. He will also have expanded his intellectual competence by learning to mobilize the data and modes of thinking of relevant disciplines in dealing with problems of scholarship or of life that transcend any one subject.

He will have freed himself from the intellectual constraints of implicitly accepted and often unconscious value systems and beliefs. He will have attained personal autonomy in arriving at intellectual decisions and moral commitments.

The liberally educated person will be esthetically sensitive, if not to the full range of arts and letters, at least to some expression of man's artistic nature. He will have developed human sensibilities; from his reading and from his human associations he will be able to respond emphathically to others, to sense their needs, their aspirations, and their potentialities.

He will have acquired a sense of personal identity—"of being one's self and not another." He will have struggled with the cultural, social, and moral issues of his own time and he will have defined his own relation to these issues. This, I take it, is the problem of relevance.

It is obvious that colleges of liberal arts are not organized to these ends. Neither, in fact, are they any longer organized, in most instances, to reflect the reality of modern scholarship. The building blocks of the university, i.e., its departments, no longer make an appropriate edifice either for liberal education, advanced scholarship, or research. Some time ago, Hutchins paid his disrespect to departments as follows:

> The heart of the multiversity is the department. In the nature of the case, the multiversity department, however brilliant its short run results in training and research, cannot understand anything. It exists, like every other subhuman organism, for the survival, reproduction, and expansion of itself. It has no knowledge of the rest of the multiversity, and cannot acquire any. Other departments are its natural enemies, because they are after the students, grants, contracts and appropriations the department wants for itself. A multiversity is, therefore, in a constant state of virtual civil war. It is held together by compromise and logrolling, that is, by Bandaids and Scotch Tape. When it is under severe pressure, as in California, the most skillful mediator in the world cannot keep

> it from falling apart. Nothing can make the multiversity what the university has to be, an intellectual community.[4]

What about the university college of liberal arts? In most instances it has little organic character. It is little more than a collection of relatively autonomous departments. Its educational structure and requirements bear little apparent relationship to the liberal values outlined above. If, out of its distributive requirements and departmental majors, the student designs a coherent educational program, he is an ingenious and purposive individual indeed. One might conclude that the liberal arts college in the complex university has become obsolete. That, at any rate, is the contention of Dean S. H. Spurr of the University of Michigan, who said recently:

> . . . The single large college of sciences, humanities, and the arts in the great American universities has reached the point of excessive size, mis-organization, and disorganization where it ceases to provide the intellectual and social leadership our culture needs.[5]

What shall we do with this monolith?

One possibility is to dismember it and distribute most of the parts among other divisions of the university. This has been done at the University of Minnesota, where the departments of Geology, Physics, and Mathematics have been moved to the Institute of Technology, in which the Department of Chemistry was already located. The Biological Sciences have been excised and combined into a College of the Biological Sciences. (The related departments in the Medical School and the College of Agriculture were too powerful to be withdrawn and incorporated in the new College.) As I have noted elsewhere, this process of dismemberment could be continued by establishing Colleges of the Behavioral Sciences and the Humanities, or, as in the case of Physics and Mathematics, the various departments could be sent to other

---

[4] Hutchins, R. M., "The University and the Multiversity," *The New Republic*, Vol. 156, No. 13, April 1, 1967, pp. 15-17.

[5] Spurr, S. H., "Organization of the Liberal Arts in the Large University," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 39, No. 1, January 1968, pp. 11-22.

professional schools, for example, Psychology to Education, Political Science to Public Administration, Sociology to Social Work, the languages to Foreign Area Studies, and English to Journalism—Siberia indeed.

It would be difficult to prove that basic disciplines would suffer by locating them in professional schools. At Wisconsin, the Biological Sciences have been in Agriculture for a long time. At Ohio, the Department of Psychology for a long period was a part of the College of Education. Many departments of Economics are located in Schools of Business Administration. Under such dispersion of the basic disciplines, if a student is to put together a program of related liberal studies, he will have to trade at most of the stores in a large shopping center—a task which, though difficult, may not be impossible.

It may be, of course, that we have expected the student to become more generally educated than the vast proliferation of modern knowledge will permit. Traditionally, the British honors degree was taken in a single subject, although the programs known as Greats and Modern Greats at Oxford were broader, and the Cambridge student could read for honors in two subjects concurrently. Organized after the war, the University of Keele extended the usual undergraduate course from three to four years, and made the first a foundation year during which the student took courses designed to introduce him to the major concepts and methods of thought of the principal fields of knowledge, and to their interrelationships; to the culture of Western Europe; and to the problems of the modern world.[6] However, none of the new British universities subsequently established followed the Keele pattern, although most of them established undergraduate curricula broader than the traditional honors degree. In particular, the University of Sussex established schools of studies rather than departments, such as Schools of Social Studies, European Studies, English and American Studies, Physical Sciences, African and Asian Studies, and Educa-

[6] Iliffe, A. H., *The Foundation Year in the University of Keele.* Keele, England: Sociological Review Monograph No. 12, July 1968, pp. 21-22.

tional Studies and Social Work. It is not yet certain, however, that these schools of studies will survive in any organic sense. On a visit to Sussex some three years ago, I said to a group of staff members that I had heard that departmentalism was already raising its ugly head. The Vice-Chancellor heatedly disagreed, but two scientists present quietly said that every change in their fields since the University was established only a few years before had been in the direction of more traditional departmental models. Apparently eternal vigilance is the price of departmental suppression. And eternal vigilance may not be enough.

Perhaps the purposes of the Sussex schools of studies can be attained by a divisional organization within the liberal arts college, or in the university at large. Again, however, if the college is subdivided merely for administrative convenience, as it often is, rather than for educational planning, student programming, and faculty deployment, little of significance will be accomplished. I suspect that a study of divisional organizations in colleges of liberal arts would show that most of them have little organic character, and that the departments which they embrace are still relatively autonomous fragments.

The divisional structure, of course, can be extended to the entire university. Under the Meyerson plan at the University of Buffalo, teaching and research staffs are organized along broad disciplinary lines into faculties, each headed by a Provost with responsibilities for budget and academic personnel, and with surveillance of both undergraduate and graduate programs of instruction and research. Departments are retained and may be represented in more than one faculty. The following faculties were established: Applied Social Sciences and Administration, Arts and Letters, Educational Studies, Engineering and Applied Sciences, Health Sciences, Law and Jurisprudence, Natural and Mathematical Sciences, Social Sciences and Philosophy. It is interesting to note that Educational Studies, which in effect means the School of Education, which presumably should have been included in the faculty of Applied Social Sciences and Administration, remained a separate unit. When I asked why, I was told that

the faculty of Applied Social Sciences declined to accept Education. One might have expected Law and Jurisprudence to be grouped with Social Sciences and Philosophy. I do not know why it was not, but I suspect that the Law School was simply powerful enough to stand alone. (In no small part, the organization of higher education is the faculty politics of higher education.)

The Meyerson plan includes a University College cutting across all of the faculties and offering baccalaureate but not specialized professional degrees in departments, divisions, special programs, or general studies. The University College calls on the several faculties for instructional services, although courses and curricula are mainly the responsibility of the several faculties coordinated by the dean of the college. President Meyerson believes that the program options should be so wide that a student committed to specialized study could pursue it as a freshman; students' educational patterns should be highly individualized and differentiated.

There are many variants of the divisional organization. The University of California at Irvine has a relatively undifferentiated School of the Social Sciences reaching down to the beginnings of the baccalaureate program. In addition to the School of the Social Sciences, there is a Graduate School of Administration. Instead of separate schools of business administration, public administration, and education, students studying administration or preparing for administrative careers take a large part of their work in common, and specialized courses in business, public administration, and education are held to the minimum. One hears, however, that the Graduate School of Administration has already run into difficulty. Faculty members in a particular administrative field want to teach their own courses in organizational theory, applying it to business or education as the case may be, as they proceed. There seems to be an inevitable tendency toward separatism rather than fruitful collaboration and meaningful integration.

Return, again, for a moment to the college of liberal arts. Dean Spurr proposed that the conventional requirements for distribution and concentration should be established by dif-

ferent faculty groups. Departments should continue to set major requirements, both for undergraduate and graduate specialization in their subjects. However, in Spurr's language, an "interdisciplinary community of scholars" should establish distribution requirements. This group should have the authority to determine what sort of course should be offered for non-majors, and how it should be staffed. Spurr went on to say that it does not follow that "a multiversity faculty of sciences, humanities, and the arts should necessarily agree upon a single set of distribution requirements. These, in fact, might vary from one curriculum or one subcollege to another."[7] I would add that they also might vary from one major subject or major program to another.

A committee of the College of Letters and Science at the University of California at Berkeley recently proposed a variant of the Spurr scheme. It recommended the establishment of a division of interdisciplinary and general studies for the purposes of offering interdisciplinary courses for general education and of administering field majors, i.e., interdepartmental or interdisciplinary programs of concentration. The committee also proposed a standing committee on the academic program with the power to approve courses submitted to satisfy the general requirements of the college, and to see that necessary and appropriate courses were offered for that purpose. The chairman of this committee would be the chairman of the division of interdisciplinary and general studies. This scheme would seem to meet Spurr's principle of dual organization, one pattern based on departments and the other on interdisciplinary groupings.

A Student-Faculty Commission on Governance at Berkeley recently proposed that a number of relatively small lower-division colleges should be established with a high degree of autonomy with respect to the admission of students, the curriculum, the staff, and the budget. Only one such college now exists—in fact, it existed before the commission reported. It is known as the Experimental Program and, curiously in this age of resistance to authority, it has a pre-

[7] Spurr, S. H., op. cit.

scribed curriculum modeled essentially on the old Meiklejohn College at the University of Wisconsin. Spurr believes that numerous subcolleges might be established within the inclusive College of Liberal Arts. He pointed out that each subcollege might have a distinctive character and a distinctive educational emphasis. He proposed that "once established, each subcollege would develop its own distribution requirements, provide its own set of admission controls consistent with the general university pattern, create its own pattern of academic counseling for the general education of its students, and arrange for the offering of appropriate courses designed for the nonmajor. Its pattern could be as similar to or as different from that of other subcolleges as its faculty wished it to be."

Dr. Warren B. Martin, one of my colleagues at the Center, believes that cluster colleges within a larger institutional setting hold great promise for personalizing education, reestablishing a community including both students and faculty members, and encouraging educational diversity. He speaks with the authority of experience, for he was the first Provost of Raymond College, an experimental college in the University of the Pacific and the first of the several cluster colleges which have been established there. Each cluster college, said Martin, should ". . . authenticate its existence by marking out a special role for itself, drawing students and faculty to it even more than to the university, and developing a characteristic style."[8]

One of the best examples of the cluster college plan is the new University of California at Santa Cruz. On the undergraduate level the institution is composed of small liberal arts colleges, each with a distinctive emphasis. Ultimately, there may be as many as 25 such colleges, and as the Santa Cruz catalog has pointed out, the size of the first college, 650 undergraduates, will be just as small when the campus reaches a projected enrollment of 16,500 in 1995. The Santa Cruz catalog summarizes the philosophy of the college organization as follows:

[8] Martin, W. B., "The Problem of Size," *Journal of Higher Education* 38: 144-152, March, 1967.

> Although every college will be devoted to the liberal arts, no attempt will be made to guarantee in each a perfect academic balance. Each will develop its own intellectual center of gravity. This intent reflects a conviction not that the world of intellect can be readily divided, but that precisely because it cannot, one can honor, without sacrifice of liberal education, a faculty's instincts to approach it from a variety of directions.

The Santa Cruz colleges are coeducational and residential. Special facilities are provided in them for commuting students. Some college faculty members live in. Most of them have offices in the college. Teaching is carried on in the colleges except for such necessarily centralized facilities as science laboratories, very large lecture halls, and the central library. Each college is headed by a Provost, who is assisted by a "Senior Preceptor" and the other Fellows, or faculty members, of the college.

Each college has a particular center of academic interest. Those already established represent special interests in the humanities, the natural sciences, the social sciences, the fine arts, international understanding, and the urban society. According to the catalog:

> . . . the colleges are not uniform, and their faculties take different views of what undergraduate education should be. One emphasis will appeal to one student, another to another. For example, one student may like the fact that Cowell imposes no special requirements in the junior and senior years, while another will feel that he wants to devote some time at the end of his undergraduate years to an interdisciplinary seminar of the kind the Crown program offers.

Each college determines the way in which its students will satisfy the broad campuswide requirements in the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. For example, Cowell College, which has a humanistic bias, will satisfy University requirements in the humanities and social sciences by a two-year sequence of courses in "World Civilization." In Crown College, which emphasizes the sciences, students will take the basic course in "Science, Culture and Man." Students need not confine their courses to the college of which they are members. Therefore, while the colleges have characteristic emphases, they do not force students into

a common mold. The opportunity for diversity of colleges, programs, and courses is very great indeed.

While cluster colleges such as those at Santa Cruz have a considerable degree of independence, they usually are not completely autonomous. There are universitywide standards and policies to which they must adhere. For example, the University of California has a specified and to some degree distinctive role to play in the California system of public higher education. All campuses are expected to develop in harmony with the overriding goals of the University. These common goals, however, do not preclude great variation in the ways they are met. There is wide opportunity for distinctiveness and differentiation among the campuses and within any one campus of the University. Nevertheless, the danger of conformity, of movement toward similarity rather than difference, is ever present.

One way to assure each cluster college the opportunity to pursue its purposes and character is to give it a strong voice in faculty recruitment and promotion. At Santa Cruz, campuswide educational interests are the province of boards of studies in the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences, each of which is presided over by a Vice Chancellor. The colleges and boards of studies together select faculty members who are both Fellows of a college and members of the academic divisions of the University. The colleges control half the budget for academic salaries, which gives them more than a purely advisory role in faculty recruitment and promotion, as well as the allocation of faculty time between undergraduate and graduate instruction, and between teaching, research, and other responsibilities. The possession of its own academic budget is crucial to the maintenance of a distinctive role for each college and to the protection of the college from the control of scholars in particular disciplines or even in particular boards of studies.

Despite at least limited budgetary support for self-determination, and despite the initial impetus toward differentiation, innovation, and experimentation, future distinctiveness at Santa Cruz is by no means assured. In fact, there is reason to believe that the colleges, and the campus as a whole, are

moving rapidly toward conventional academic norms and values. Although the colleges have sincerely attempted to recruit staff who are interested in both teaching and research, the qualifications for appointment and promotion must meet Universitywide standards. These standards, as they have been applied in the past, and as they are almost certain to be applied in the future, will emphasize research and specialized scholarship at the expense of teaching and the values of a liberal education. Furthermore, faculty members are professionals, members of their professional guilds, and the sanctions of their scholarly peers are almost certain to be far more powerful than the rewards of innovative teaching. In the struggle between the needs and norms of the college and the pressures and standards of the boards of studies, the colleges as undergraduate academic communities will almost certainly lose. As an analyst of the cluster colleges at Santa Cruz and at other innovative institutions put it:

> The colleges are at a disadvantage if the faculty person discovers he does not have time to give to activities that advance the interests of the college, such as involvement with students or the implementation and refinement of college innovations and, at the same time, to activities such as research and publications that advance him in his guild. The college is local, the guild is national. Faculty are likely to think one way when sitting as the governing body of a college and another way when sitting as the (college) division of the academic senate, because the emphases are different and perhaps irreconcilable.[9]

The findings of this study warn us that changes in structure may only disguise the perpetuation of conventional educational values. "External variety and surface change have concealed the uniformity and rigidity in fundamental values," said the investigator, "even as false confidence that differences in external forms and appearances must result in varied internal assumptions, or . . . that differences in structure and function are always manifestations of differences in values, has diverted attention from that prerequisite to signi-

---

[9] Martin, W. B., *Institutional Character in Colleges and Universities: The Interaction of Idealogy, Organization, and Innovation.* Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1969, p. ix-43.

ficant change—examination of the deep values."[10] We can change the structure without changing the orientation of students, the faculty's educational ideals, the sanctions and rewards of the teaching profession, the administrative stereotypes, and, finally, the depth and variety of students' learning. New structures must be infused with new values.

Some of the same tendencies toward conventional patterns can be found at the new University of York in England, after which, more than any other institution perhaps, the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California was modeled. At York, faculty members attached to particular departments, such as history, are distributed among the several colleges, which include classrooms, seminar rooms, common rooms, a small library, and a dining hall, as well as student residences and faculty offices. In some instances, at least, faculty members are unhappy about being distributed among the colleges rather than housed adjacent to their own departmental colleagues. Presumably, an historian would much rather be near another historian than a scholar in the humanities or the social sciences. One of the York administrative officers predicted that before long the offices would be rearranged so that faculty members teaching the same subject would be collected into departmental enclaves. It has been difficult at both York and Santa Cruz to get scientists to spend much time in the colleges. They spend long hours in the laboratory, and combine lectures and demonstrations, so that they have limited time for college associations. One of the distinguished scientists at Santa Cruz said that his college connection was reduced to little more than an occasional appearance at dinner.

Organizational flexibility and ingenuity are not only necessary in undergraduate education; they are equally necessary in graduate and professional education. As knowledge advances, new specialties emerge. New intellectual interests often require the reorganization of knowledge into new relationships. Sometimes new systems of knowledge are organized into departments. In other instances, they may

[10] Martin, W. B., ibid., p. xi-2.

simply be called programs, bringing together teachers and students with common intellectual interests from two or more disciplines or specialties. Sometimes these programs will have a long life, such as those at the University of Chicago supervised by the Committee on Human Development and the Committee on the History of Thought. In other instances, programs may have a shorter life arising from a confluence of student and faculty interests and dissolving when the participants turn to other scholarly activities. In an address on "The Search for Alternative Models," David Riesman gave as examples a program on multi-ethnic societies "... which could take advantage of the presence on the campus of an anthropologist who had worked in Indonesia, a theologian who had studied at Louvain, an ethno-musicologist with an interest in jazz, a socio-linquist with an interest in dialect, and so on." He pointed out that this and other groups need not be institutionalized permanently. "Such a procedure," he said, "would avoid the need to staff interdisciplinary courses in an arbitrary way because of previous illusions of compatibility, for example between sociologists and political scientists or anthropologists and psychologists—illusions usually with a short half life."

In other instances, programs might properly become institutionalized. On the new University of California campus at Irvine, one will find in the division of the biological sciences, departments of molecular and cell biology, organismic biology, population and environmental biology, and psychobiology. These departmental names have new sounds, and in fact they represent new developments in biological knowledge and in the relationships between the biological sciences and the environmental and social sciences.

An even wider horizon for the biological sciences is envisaged in the new Honors School of the Human Sciences at Oxford which will enable students to study problems which involve the biological sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. The human sciences now take their place beside the other interdisciplinary schools which Oxford has had for many years, namely, *Literae Humaniores*, commonly called Greats; Philosophy, Politics, and Economics, the slang name

of which, as the University of Oxford Handbook puts it, is Modern Greats: and Psychology, Philosophy, and Physiology.

The very conception of many professions is changing, and professional education, therefore, is broadening its scope by incorporating with professional studies related work in the disciplines fundamental or central to professional knowledge and practice, and correlative studies in related professional fields. The law as it is now conceived, is one of the behavioral sciences. Therefore, as I have observed elsewhere:

> . . . there is increasing recognition of the fact that the corpus of the law is growing and changing, as other social institutions develop, in response to new human needs and new human purposes; greater understanding of human motivations, and the causes of individual and social behavior; and changing consensus on social and moral issues. Thus, new links are woven between law and other disciplines, including science, social science, and philosophy.[11]

Medicine, too, is reaching out to the social and environmental sciences. Modern medicine is studies in the context of full normal human development, not only in its biological, but also in its social and environmental phases. Medical education now focuses on the patient in his economic and cultural environment. Thus, the behavioral sciences do not merely come to the support of medicine; medicine in effect joins the behavioral sciences. This is one of the reasons why the University of California has proposed to build around its Medical School in San Francisco undergraduate and graduate programs in both the biological and the behavioral sciences.

There is as yet no agreement on how the medical fields and the behavioral sciences can be brought into effective relation in the university and in the profession itself. Methods which have been tried include the incorporation of research teams of social scientists in schools of medicine; joint appointments between the medical school and such departments as anthropology, psychology, and sociology; and full-

[11] McConnell, T.R., Anderson, G. L., and Hunter, Pauline, "The University and Professional Education," in N. B. Henry (editor), *Education for the Professions*, 61st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 19 2, p. 263.

fledged divisions of the social sciences in the medical school.[12] To these should be added interdepartmental seminars and interdisciplinary research teams. Medical students should be associated in classroom and clinic with students in the other health fields, abnormal psychologists, counseling psychologists, speech pathologists, and other personnel from the behavioral sciences.

Professionals in many fields now collaborate in their practice. The solution of urban problems, for example, may require the services of city planners, members of the health professions, social workers, educators, economists, artists, musicians, and dramatists. The beginnings, at least, of this collaboration should take place in the university, not only in courses, seminars, and research projects, but in community task forces relating formal study to field work.

Whatever in structure, procedure, or administrative bureaucracy impedes the kinds of educational flexibility I have been illustrating should be eradicated, revised, or circumvented. Perhaps every complex university should periodically appoint task forces to keep educational and administrative structures under continuing surveillance. Each appraisal should begin with a review of the university's functions, its general goals, and its more specific educational objectives. Whatever administrative organization is instrumental to these purposes should be retained. The remainder should be scrapped or revised to make it relevant.

Perhaps the major test of organizational flexibility is the capacity of the university to individualize students' educational programs. The key to the whole strategy of individualization within a rich diversity of structures and programs is student counseling. Counseling should assist the student to come to terms with himself, to recognize his general academic aptitude and his special abilities, to identify his educational and vocational interests, to explore his intellectual orientations, and to look objectively at his attitudes and values. Counseling services should also help him discover the range of educational options open to him and the career lines

[12] Ibid., p. 264.

among which he might choose. Then the individual should be in a position to correlate his personal characteristics with educational and vocational careers and to design a relevant educational program.

This design should not be irrevocable. As the student learns more about himself and about the worlds of ideas and careers, he should be able to change course without an excessive penalty. An early study of National Merit Scholarship winners and runners-up showed that 40 per cent of them changed their intended field of concentration during the first year of college. About the same time, a study at the University of Keele showed that the same proportion of students changed their intended fields of specialization during the foundation year. A more recent Keele study revealed that the proportion of students changing their major fields had risen to two-thirds. These data suggest that not only is it important to provide an opportunity for a student to review his characteristics and his program, but that it is important to provide for reasonably easy transit from one part of a complicated institution to another.

To my knowledge, the best device which has been invented to enable a student to plan a unique curriculum, and to use the resources of an entire university for that purpose, is the University College at the University of Minnesota. This College has a small administrative staff composed of the dean and a group of educational advisers. The College has no faculty of its own. It does not offer any courses. It has no building, only a small suite of offices. Its sole purpose is to assist students to plan individual programs that cut across the fences that separate departments, schools, and colleges. The University College does not offer a convenient means of escape from the requirements of established majors. Neither does it accept students whose educational purposes can be served adequately by any one of the regular divisions of the University. It accepts only students who have a clear-cut educational purpose which can be attained only by combining courses for general and specialized education from more than one of the major jurisdictions of the University. I

know of no better device for leveling the walls that separate the college of liberal arts from the professional schools.

The same method of individualization should be applied to both professional and graduate education. The graduate school usually encompasses the entire university. Therefore, it should encourage students to exploit the resources of the entire institution in organizing a program of study and an investigation. It seems to me to be unnecessary, in fact, undesirable, to fit graduate students into prestructured programs. I used to be under pressure from the office of the dean to lay out one or more sequences in higher education. This I stubbornly declined to do on the ground that the student's background, his particular interests and intentions, and his capabilities should determine his doctoral program. One of the other characteristics of the doctorate in higher education at Berkeley is that relatively few courses in higher education as such are offered in the School of Education. According to his interests, the student selects relevant courses and seminars wherever he finds them in the University at large. The student interested in the organization and administration of higher education, for example, may choose seminars in organizational and administrative theory in the departments of sociology, public administration, psychology, or business administration. He caps this pattern of courses with a seminar directed particularly toward the problems of organization and administration in colleges and universities. His research may be directed jointly by a faculty member in the School of Education and one from another division of the University. There is no reason why it could not be directed entirely by a scholar outside the School of Education. I use this program in higher education as one simple example of how resources from many parts of an institution can be mobilized around particular centers of interest.

To summarize: It seems obvious that an institution as large and complex as our major universities must have a fairly complicated structure if it is to operate with a reasonable degree of efficiency. There must be a division of educational responsibilities. Decision-making bodies and their jurisdictions must be specified. The foci of authority must be identi-

fied. But it seems equally obvious that no structure, at any rate no structure yet devised, will neatly or fully serve all the functions, all the scholars, or all the students in the institution. The purposes of the university should be defined, and an organization should then be designed that will facilitate and not impede the attainment of these goals. As the balance among the functions of a university changes, the organization may need to be redesigned. It is conceivable that what Dr. Clark Kerr calls the urban-grant university will look quite different from the land-grant university. To do for the cities what the land-grant universities did for agriculture and rural life probably will require a combination of scholars, researchers, and "extension agents" different from those of which the agricultural experiment stations and extension divisions were composed.

As the world outside changes, so must the university adapt its organization. The growing concern for man's environment and man's relation to it stimulated at Berkeley the organization of a new college, the College of Environmental Design, which incorporates the old school of architecture and divisions of city and regional planning, landscape architecture, and basic design.

As man's knowledge expands and new disciplines emerge, new groups of scholars join forces in teaching and research. New departments and new schools may be required. New research institutes, such as a space science laboratory, may be organized to enable scholars from many fields, who might not otherwise have collaborated, to form new research teams.

As students change, so must the organization be adapted. Many students today are not particularly interested in subjects or disciplines as such, but in how those subjects may be used to investigate problems which beset our society and our people. So the students, faculty members, and administrators decided that the first of the cluster colleges at Old Westbury in New York should be devoted to a work-study program in urban affairs, with emphasis on the problems of race and poverty. Another institution may attract a large number of intellectually able and intellectually interested students who will make new demands on courses and teachers, and who

will be impatient to begin their specialized work at once. If this demand does not require a new college, it is likely at least to necessitate new kinds or new sequences of courses, more independent study, and closer relationships between students and faculty.

The static university is an institution of the past. The new university will have to adapt itself much more rapidly and purposefully to changing conditions and demands inside the academic community and in the world around it. And, as I have suggested, the final test of organizational effectiveness, which in classical organization theory would have been evidence of inefficiency, is the ability of the individual student and individual scholar to disregard the formal structure and to devise whatever arrangements are necessary for the attainment of well-conceived intellectual purposes.

VI.

Restructuring the University

Richard R. Perry*

University education at present and during the past five years has found itself consistently criticized for its lack of relevance, its inability to satisfy the educational "needs of our time," and for its lack of positive and defensible actions in the face of student dissatisfaction. Claims of faculty apathy and "administrative arrogance" are neither new nor surprising to those who are careful students of higher education, nor is it enlightening or even refreshing to listen to the clamor for student participation in the governance of universities as an idea which is new to higher education. What is proposed today as innovative, challenging, experimental and—to use the crowning accolade—democratic, is neither new, democratic, nor particularly challenging. Most such comments denote ignorance of Santayana's admonition that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Historically speaking, one should remember that the first great universities of western culture were established principally by students. If one bypasses the efforts of Plato in the establishment of the academy and makes the transition to early medieval times with the founding of the universities in Milan and Salerno, one notes that these institutions were

* Professor of Higher Education, The University of Toledo.

founded and sustained in response to the needs of students. Faculties were almost completely at the mercy of students in terms of administrative policy, tenure and salaries paid. The great universities of Bologna, Oxford and Paris achieved their distinguished reputations and their reason for existence because they concentrated almost exclusively on the study of a single profession. Bologna was centered on Law and Medicine, Oxford and Paris on theology. This should be remembered as we consider the difficulties in which we find universities today.

Models from Antiquity

The argument that a university should be structured to meet either the needs of its students or the needs of society which supports it, is not new. There have always existed serious disagreements about how the goals of students and society can be effectively merged within a university. Often goals of faculty and students have met head on. At the University of Paris in the 1200's the faculty was turned out in mass by students for its failure to attend to the teaching needs of its students. Oxford was founded on a separation of students from the University of Paris, occasioned by a serious intellectual parting of the ways over philosophy of religion. Oxford students who became disgruntled with the townspeople over student use of the town and the people in it, not finding the town interested in changing its attitude, moved from Oxford to Cambridge.

The situation has not changed from what it was at the beginning of the university system. Today's popular press is filled with the layman's concern about rioting on the campus, disputations among faculty members, and the low esteem in which administration is held by both students, legislators, faculty, and others. Yet consider what even the most renowned medieval universities were like. In Bologna a group of students formed a student guild and hired competent authorities to instruct them. Morris Bishop, a noted medieval scholar, describes the student-faculty relationship in these terms:

174

> "The condition of the professor on the other hand was pitiable. He had to swear obedience to the student rector. If he wished a leave of absence for a single day, he had to first humbly request it of his students then have the permissions approved by the rector and the student council. He could not leave town without depositing a security for his return. He was forbidden to create holidays at his pleasure. If he failed to get five students for an ordinary lecture or three for an extraordinary one, he was declared absent and fined. If his popularity waned he might bribe students to attend his lectures. He had to begin his morning lesson before the last peal of St. Peter's church bell and he had to stop with its next toll. Students were required to leave the classroom while the bell was ringing. There would be none of a professor's desperate afterthoughts. A professor was fined if he skipped a chapter or decretal or if he postponed a troublesome question to the end of his lecture in the hope of submerging it in the bell's clamor. A professor was obliged to follow a schedule to reach a certain point in his text by a certain day. At the beginning of the academic year he deposited ten Bologna pounds with a banker as security for the payment of his fines. A committee of students, the Denunciatores Doctorum, kept close watch on him for his spiritual good.[1]

The medieval university was a student's garden of bliss. It could be an absolute burning hell for a professor as was the case with Cecco d'Ascoli who in 1327 was burned by the students of Bologna for making some mistakes in his course on Astrology.[2]

Models from Antiquity—Relevant Today

There are characteristics of those universities which need to be kept in mind as one talks about the restructuring of a university today. These medieval universities were the epitome of student governance in terms of decisions made about the value of courses and who was to be employed. Today there is student interest in the matter of the employment and retention of faculty. There is student interest in the matter of which courses shall be taught, and in the marketable value of the education which has led to emphasis on specialization.

The development of higher education in Europe moved ahead on the lines of specialization in each of the universities.

---

[1] Morris Bishop, "Scholares Medii Aevi," *Horizon*, Summer 1968, v. 10, 3, pp. 68-69.

[2] *Ibid.*

Faculties were renowned for their specialties in a particular discipline. Little or no attempt was made to combine the disciplines into what is known as an interdisciplinary approach. Inasmuch as the medieval university was commercially oriented, the curriculum was vocationally oriented to a particular guild. Courses in the arts were for those who, because of position, would not need to go to work to benefit themselves or the rest of the world.

When the transition to the colonies came about, colleges as they were established sought to mold themselves after European models. In 1729 William and Mary was established and for the first 28 years of its existence 8 of the 13 faculty members were from Oxford; 7 of these 8 had in one way or another been connected with a single college there.[3] Perhaps the unaccustomed freedom from the dominating influence of student interest in their own home universities led educators to see to it that a heavy administrative hand was created from the very beginning. Outside of the fact that the president of an institution was expected to be its chief scholar and to demonstrate that scholarship by teaching, the heavy weight of authority in the institution rested with the faculty and its board of overseers, directors or trustees. This was a far cry from the authority which had been located with students in the early European universities.

Strength of Departments

A major difficulty which stands in the way of restructuring any major university is that of the lengthy and time-honored argument which has run throughout the history of higher education over what strength, what authority, what importance must be placed on the ability of a discipline to control its own destiny. Traditionally, the academic department in American higher education has represented the scholarly strength of an institution. Clearly patterned after the ancient medieval guild structures of the first universities, this departmental structure locates the competence of an institution. All

[3] John S. Brubacher and Rudy Willis, *Higher Education in Transition*, Harper Brothers, 1958, p. 4.

questions concerning the excellence of graduates are answered in terms of the quality of the teaching-research departments. Anyone seeking to suggest a model different than the present for organizational structure must contend with the strength of the academic departments.

The roots of the departments are deep in American college organization and these roots extend even deeper into the antiquities of education. For example, when Henry Dunster set up the course of study at the first English American college he described it as follows:

> Primus annus Rhetoricam docebit, secundus et tertius Dialecticam, quartus adiungat Philosophiam.[4]

The similarity between this early American curriculum and the trivium and quadrivium of classical antiquity is apparent. The trivium included grammar, rhetoric and logic; the quadrivium included geometry, arithmetic, music and astronomy. These were the basis for our seven liberal arts, and they remain today the seven strongest, most deeply entrenched departments of most colleges of arts and sciences. English, philosophy, mathematics and the physical sciences as well as the humanities, are without question the masters of curriculum control and organization on most campuses. Some will argue that the stress placed on the importance of the department is harmful to university organization and point with some justification to the organization of universities in France, Britain and Germany as not as inclined toward emphasis on departmental organization as American universities.

The European system has been much more personalized in its organizational structure than the American system, placing great academic and administrative power in professional chairs. Changes in modern society threaten such systems but the desire to continue them is strong.

Need for Change in Structure

The fundamental reason why universities must turn atten-

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

177

tion to restructuring themselves is that students, the public, and the academic world recognize increasingly that the fruits of education must have almost immediate practical application to society's needs. While there will always be reason and necessity for unrestricted, unfettered, and undisturbed pure research in the university, a major task in any administrative restructuring of an educational institution is to enable the institution to martial its resources to satisfy societal needs. It is almost as if a university represents a limitless source of talent, intellect, and spirit to which society seems increasingly to turn for assistance in solving multiple problems. This in itself presents one of the great dangers to the existence and viability of an institution of higher education.

Society expects much from our universities. Legislators, newspaper editors, ministers, self-appointed student leaders, foreign visitors, and armchair quarterbacks all issue announcements of what higher education should do. These cover everything from undefeated sport seasons to year-round operations, seeing to it that only those professors who teach what someone else thinks ought to be taught are employed, and of course, expressing opinions as to which students should be admitted to which universities regardless of their previous qualifications. The university is sometimes its own worst enemy when faced with restructuring, for it gets so much advice from all who are interested that it sometimes does not act much like a community of well informed people.

Major reasons for restructuring a university can be identified as:

(1) Present university organizational structure will, in all probability, prove inadequate to successfully meet the educational challenges of our immediate future.

(2) Present organizational structures of university departments which are based on narrow disciplines are proving unsuccessful at meeting society's problems. The departmental structure, in short, lacks maneuverability to meet rapidly changing educational challenges.

(3) For the most part, present academic organizations within a university are too small in terms of organizational

size to effectively compete with each other for limited resources. One cannot expect the needs of departments with only two or three members—or perhaps only one—to receive as much notice and consideration over a long period of time as departments ten to twenty times their size.

(4) Present administrative structures of universities and particularly colleges, it seems, artificially force faculty of diverse interest, inclination and intent, to work together toward poorly defined and obscure educational goals.

Recent survey research on an analysis of a decision system at a university reveals that when faculty are asked to which disciplines other than their own they turn regularly for assistance in their teaching, writing, and research, and to which disciplines other than their own they recommend their students, the weight of inclination is in the direction of those academic areas most like their own in the way knowledge is generally viewed. They do not evidence any trend to refer to those disciplines which are not like their own in content, nature and intent. A professor of English is much more likely to turn to the foreign languages, philosophy, or history than he is to chemistry, biology or physics for assistance. The same trend is revealed by answers of students who were asked to which disciplines other than their major they turned in accomplishing their goals. What higher education has done is to impose an organizational structure which does not effectively encourage, enhance or reinforce relationships between faculties and students of like or near like interests and intent.

Higher education makes the situation even worse when it splits faculties of like interests and backgrounds into separate colleges—for example, placing some philosophers in colleges of education and other philosophers in arts colleges. After doing this, the organization expects that the two faculties will have meaningful, continuous and useful dialogue which will create interdisciplinary approaches to the teaching of subject matter. Somehow the interdisciplinary approach was expected to bring to bear on a societal problem or a period of history, the expertise of several different disciplines. A course

such as Mankind Past and Present, taught with an interdisciplinary goal by a philosopher, a psychologist, an historian and a sociologist, ends up generally being taught as philosophy by the philosopher, sociology by the sociologist, history by the historian, and as psychology by the psychologist. Perhaps the example is overdrawn, but this has been a major criticism of interdisciplinary efforts. A corollary problem has been the difficulty of finding persons who are willing to step outside the secure competence of their own specialties, to attempt the responsibilities of a new course venture.

> "History," Ortega has written, "proceeds very often by jumps. These jumps in which tremendous distances may be covered are called generations. A generation in form, in shape, can achieve what centuries have failed to achieve with form."[5]

Lay this statement alongside one by Robert Maynard Hutchins which says:

> Whether . . . it would not be better to forget about most of the existing colleges and plan new institutions that would undertake the overwhelming important task that colleges and universities have given up.[6]

What does all of this mean? If higher education is to keep pace with history, then it must be prepared to jump, and to cover tremendous distances very quickly. This calls for maneuverability. Secondly, if colleges and universities take up the "overwhelming important task" that Hutchins indicates they have given up, something different must be done from that of the immediate past which was "history oriented" in order to serve our present society which is "future oriented." In the year before he retired, the former Vice President for Academic Affairs at a major state university said he felt that, for all except a few universities, size was turning them into monstrous mastodons of mediocrity. He seems to have meant that universities were becoming slow in their reaction to the needs of society, dull-witted, in terms of programs offered as

---

[5] William Arrowsmith, "Idea of a New University," *The Center Magazine*, Vol. III, 2 (March, 1970), p. 47.

[6] *Ibid.*

solutions to social problems, and monstrous because universities should be the last places with their kinds of resources to be so out of step with what should be done. If this is our problem, if this is what we have defined as the reason for higher education's problems, then it is reasonable to ask for a new design.

A New Design

For that new design I suggest we turn our attention to antiquity, to the trivium with its grammar, rhetoric and logic, and the quadrivium with its arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy—building our new university in modern natural arrangements on these. Before someone decides that all that is offered is old wine in new bottles, consideration is asked for the intent, the purpose, the function, the effect of that ancient classification of subject matter. Rhetoric and grammar were to get at the problems of man's communication with man. Arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy were to provide computational skills in order that man could quantify and make practical his understanding. Music, which included much that we consider theatre, was there to embellish man's existence with esthetic experiences. Logic was to provide a base for man's ethical and ordered existence. I suggest that these are the major problems of man's existence today. We hear it said that we fail to communicate, that we fail to properly perceive and understand in scientific terms the universe around us. We are criticized for de-humanizing our existence and for not providing enough esthetic experience for all; and lastly, we criticize and castigate ourselves for not having constructed an ethical and well-ordered society.

Colleges and universities ought to, indeed must, organize themselves to attack these major problems of our time:

(1) The moral and ethical directions of man.
(2) The life style of man.
(3) The esthetic experience of man.
(4) The life support systems of man.

Just as colleges and universities built their academic organ-

izational structures on the disciplines which emerged out of the ancient trivium and quadrivium, so the modern university and that of the future will have to mold its organization academically out of modern adaptations to the ancient curricula. In order that this be done, one may hypothesize that colleges could overcome a good many of their internal jurisdictional difficulties over content of curriculum and educational goals for departments if, instead of having departments, universities would be organized on the basis of five to seven major faculties. It can be hypothesized that there is desire on the part of faculty and students who have like interests to have closer contact with each other. Thus, it is suggested that faculties be formed for the humanities, for the fine and performing arts, for computational and applied sciences, for administrative and behavioral science and for the natural and medical sciences. Present college structures such as Business Administration, Education, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Pharmacy, and Law—as well as Optometry, Agriculture, etc.—should cease to function as effective authoritative administrative structures for the planning and execution of educational programs. The advantage of this, it seems organizationally, is that all faculty who research, teach, and work in the fields of study associated with the humanities would be together as one group. Consequently, we would not have small departments of philosophy in a College of Arts and Sciences and yet smaller similar faculties in a College of Education. Behavioral scientists, now operating with professional college affiliation such as in Business Administration, could be more closely associated in the planning of behavioral science, curricula matters with those operating presently in Arts and Sciences. The same would hold true for others operating in different disciplines in different colleges who ought to be brought together in order to pool resources of talent and to provide for an easier exchange of opinions. This, of course, if implemented would mean a closer examination of educational programs, curricula and the content of courses. Hopefully, it would represent a reduction in the number of similar courses offered in different colleges. Hopefully also, it could simplify student problems of planning an

educational program either for their own personal interests or toward some certification.

Colleges for Advising

One of the great deficiencies in present university organization is that void where very strong and continuing relationships should be developed. That void exists in the student advising system. The faculty is so busy in preparation for the teaching and research associated with the instructional process that it literally does not have adequate time to spend lengthy periods in consultation with all students who desire such contact. To release the time of competent faculty for a formalized advising operation is to dissipate the most important resource of the university: the intellectual power of its faculty. Also, when institutions use faculty as clerks, they waste time, energy and money. Faculty, for the most part, should be freed from any formal administrative identification with student advising. In order that this be done and the educational advising needs of students served better than at present, it is suggested that colleges become *student advising centers* staffed with personnel who can devote their time and energy to familiarizing themselves with the program requirements of each of the several degree and certificate programs offered by the institution. Freed of the necessity to qualify as teaching or research faculty, these persons can become expert in a most important area of service. Unless students have a cadre of advisers available to them who have developed a continuous experience with the many changes which exist in academic programs, students will forever be at sea without direction as to the most effective way to proceed toward the immediate goal of their education.

Faculties might be organized into larger academic units. The myraid number of departments could be consolidated into perhaps five, and not more than seven faculties aligned and interested in the same general areas. For example, a present undergraduate curriculum which includes natural science, biology, botany, zoology, chemistry, physics, geology, biophysics, biochemistry, physical chemistry, geo-

physics and a further variety of technological subjects rooted in the above, were all at one time explained under the heading of natural philosophy. Every offshoot from the original major areas of study has represented a further advance in the demand that the theoretical knowledge be organized in such fashion as to provide for some greater useful application of it for the benefit of society. Some argue that new criteria for the selection of subject matter should be applied in order to cease this proliferation of departmental structures. The argument here is that proliferation of knowledge will inevitably continue and that one should not organize increasing numbers of administrative units to represent every different identification of an area of specialization within a much larger general field of knowledge. Let the specializations be represented but let them in all aspects be organized together under some unifying descriptive heading.

Expected Benefits

Aside from the possible benefits which might accrue to curriculum planning, one of the major issues in university reorganization, there are substantial benefits to be realized in relieving faculty resources of the burden of increasing amounts of administrative work. Every time a new department is created or a new program approved, the administrative load on the departmental organization and college administrative organization requires that an additional increment of faculty time be spent on administration rather than on the important details of teaching and research. Present university organization places faculty in administrative positions where they seldom if ever make use of the special expert skill of their disciplines in the discharge of administrative responsibilities. After giving some thought to this statement, one department chairman analyzed his activity as department chairman and realized that not once did he ever make use of his professional skills as a scholar. If one looks at the distribution of faculty resources in terms of time spent on various activities, it is interesting to note that as much as 25 per cent of total faculty time is spent on administrative affairs at the

department and college level. A reduction in demand for this type of activity could bring about a substantial increase in faculty availability for teaching and research.

Basically, in a new organizational structure a university would become a system of colleges with a staff of academic advisers and enrolled students who are interested in academic programs advised by colleges and taught by the faculties. Faculties would represent five to seven major areas of knowledge, or main problems of mankind corresponding to the colleges. The faculties would be responsible for the courses and requirements requisite for the educational programs of the colleges, as well as the attendant staffing and budgeting. From their major areas of specialty, the faculty would be in a better position to plan and execute educational programs more effectively than at present. Organization into five to seven larger units would bring the benefits of more nearly equal organizations in terms of size and consequently of strength. More important than this would be the distinct advantage that in operating from a much larger base of resources than available in a small department, each faculty could better bring its strength to bear on the immediate problems of society. When a university is asked to immediately respond to a program need in urban studies, it would hopefully be able to draw its resources from the larger faculties without the necessity to create separate administrative units to handle such programs.

Faculty should have prime responsibility and authority for decisions about the content and execution of academic programs. Support services should be provided by administrators who can free faculty from the burden of administrative work. While administration is a respected art, it cannot permit its function to detract from the time and energy faculty have to spend on teaching and research.

As well as effective organization of the faculty of a university, attention must be paid to the organization of the levels of instruction and, in doing so, student interest should be merged with faculty competence at the right levels to provide for effective instruction. It is ridiculous to assume that every student can begin at the same level of difficulty in

any subject. Neither his interest, his previous education, nor his innate ability supports that kind of foolishness. Universities, their faculties and their students must be effectively organized if they are to accommodate almost instantly new programs suited to diverse student preparation. This means that universities must clearly recognize different educational experiences for different qualities of students and yet provide within their structures almost total mobility, so that any student may move from one level of instruction without serious loss of time or interest. This can be much better accomplished if universities would diminish the number of separate schools and colleges which create artificial barriers to the free movement of students from one program to another. At present, curricula and educational programs represent to a great extent the inbred interest of those who teach, and seldom in the great scheme of things represent direct attention to the needs of society.

This difficulty can be overcome if universities can be restructured to the end that they are better able to react quickly and with force to the challenges of the future by making it more probable that the single greatest resource of the institution—the competence of its faculty—be released from all demands on its time which would prevent it from a maximum effort of teaching and research. This effort, in turn, must be focused on the new problems of our society identified by continuous involvement of the faculty in the affairs of society, and particularly with students who come to them for education.

Selected Bibliography

Anderson, G. Lester. "Colleges and Universities—Organization and Administration." *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1960.

Argyris, Chris. *Executive Leadership.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Ashby, Sir Eric. *The Community of Universities.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Ayers, Archie R. and Hallis, Ernest. "Differentiating the Functions of Administrating Officers in Colleges and Universities," *Higher Education,* XX (December, 1963), 3-6.

Bass, Bernard M. *Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1960.

Bauer, Ronald C. *Cases in College Administration.* New York: Teachers' College Press, 1955.

Bellows, Roger. *Creative Leadership.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Benne, Kenneth D. and Chin, Robert, eds. *The Planning of Change.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Bennis, Warren G. "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior." *Administrative Science Quarterly.* IV (December, 1959), 259-301.

Blackwell, Thomas E. *College and University Administration.* New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

Burns, Gerald P., ed. *Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.

Campbell, R.F. and Gregg, R.T. *Administrative Behavior in Education.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Capen, S.P. *The Management of Universities,* Buffalo: Foster and Stewart, 1953.

Corson, John J. *Governance of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Deferrari, Roy J., ed. *College Organization and Administration.* Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1947.

Dimock, M.E. *A Philosophy of Administration.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1958.

Dixon, J.P. "The Authority Structure: Legality and Reality." *The Study of Academic Administration.* Edited by T.F. Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1963.

Etzioni, Amitai. *Modern Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Foster, Julian F.S. "A Political Model for the University," *Educational Record,* XLIX (Fall, 1968), 435-443.

Gross, Neal. "Organizational Lag in American Universities: Disparities between Goals and Structural Arrangements." *Harvard Educational Review,* XXXIII (Winter, 1963), 58-73.

Haas, E. and Collen, L. "Administrative Practices in University Departments." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* VIII (June, 1963), 44-60.

Hack, Walter G., Ramseyer, John A., Gephart, William J., and Heck, James B., eds. *Educational Administration: Selected Readings.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Halpin, Andrew W. *Theory and Research in Administration.* New York: MacMillan Co., 1966.

Hungate, T.L. *Management in Higher Education.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Koontz, Harold and O'Donnell, Cyril. *Principles of Management: An Analysis of Managerial Functions.* Third Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1964.

Likert, Rensis. *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Lindsay, E.E. and Holland, E.O. *College and University Administration.* New York: MacMillan Co., 1930.

Lubbers, Irwin J. *College Organization and Administration.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1932.

Mailick, Sidney and VanNess, Edward H. *Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

McConnell, Thomas R. *A General Pattern for American Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McGrath, Earl J., ed. *Selected Issues in College Administration.* New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1967.

McVey, Frank L. and Hughes, Raymond. *Problems of College and University Administration.* Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Millett, John D. *The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Morphet, Edgar; Johns, Rowe L.; Reller, Theodore L. *Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues.* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Murray, R.L. "On Departmental Development: A Theory." *Journal of General Education,* XVI (October, 1964), 227-236.

"On the Concept of Organizational Goal, "*Administrative Science Quarterly,* IX (June, 1964), 1-22.

"The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities." *The Study of Academic Administration.* Edited by T.F. Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1963.

Personality and Organization. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Pfeffner, John McDonald. *Administrative Organization.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Presthus, R.U. *The Organizational Society: An Analysis and a Theory.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

128

Rourke, Francis E. and Brooks, Glenn E. *The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1966.

Russell, John Dale. "Changing Patterns of Administrative Organization in Higher Education." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCI (September, 1955), 22-31.

Schubik, M. "Studies and Theories of Decision-Making." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* III (December, 1958), 289-306.

Shartle, Carroll and Stogdill, Ralph M. *Methods in the Study of Administrative Leadership.* Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, 1955.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior,* New York: MacMillan Co., 1957.

Tannenbaum, Ribert; Weschler, Irving R. and Massarik, Fred. *Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Taylor, Harold. *The Goals of Higher Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Thompson, Victor A. *Modern Organization.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Triandis, H.C. "Notes on the Design of Organizations." *Approaches to Organizational Design.* Edited by J.D. Thompson. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966.

University of Oregon. Center of the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. *Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences.* Eugene, Oregon, 1965.

Urwick, Lyndall F. *The Pattern of Management.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Walton, John. *Administration and Policy-Making in Education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

White, Goodrich C. *The Education of the Administrator.* Nashville: Board of Education, Methodist Church, 1957.

Williams, Robert. *The Administration of Academic Affairs in Higher Education.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Wilson, Logan, ed. *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Wilson, Robert E. *Educational Administration.* Columbus: C.E. Merrill Books, 1966.